THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*
A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 8. NOVEMBER 1931. Vol. XXI.

IN MEMORIAM
NATHAN SÖDERBLOM

From the Swedish of Professor Tor Andrae, Upsala.
Translated by Edith Garland Jayne.

'A leader whose relationship to the realities of life was a broad and sane one, and whose artistic endowments found expression in all that he undertook.'

ON All Saints' Day, twenty-five years ago, the following words were spoken by Professor Nathan Söderblom: 'Saints are human beings who reveal to us that God lives. They are not superhuman paragons—since perfection is not to be found in this sinful world—but the sphere in which they move becomes known through the creative power of genius, and more especially by their kindness of heart and purity of purpose; theirs are the eternal riches, the creative life of God.'

These words come unbidden to one's memory, at a time when the speaker's own wonderfully fruitful life-work has been so suddenly brought to a close.

The windows of his birthplace looked out upon one of the most beautiful districts of Helsingland: the wide valley district of Norr-Dellen, ringed in by mountains of never-fading blue. How the dreams and the spirit of legend must have fascinated one who possessed in so high a degree the spritely gift of imagination.

But he also learned in his home that life consists, in the first place, of work and industry. His father, a noted revivalist, and highly esteemed as a shepherd of souls, was a richly-gifted man, but restless and impulsive, a fiery spirit, never sparing himself,

and demanding much from others, perhaps especially from his eldest son. Not only was Nathan expected to return home every half-year with the highest certificates it was possible to obtain; when his schoolwork was done, he had to lend a hand with the work in the fields.

Jonas Söderblom farmed his own glebe, and from his tenth year, Nathan's working-capacity was an asset to be reckoned on. The Archbishop himself set a high value on the fact that he had learnt by personal experience the conditions of heavy physical labour, and his characteristic kindliness was based on a broad and thorough knowledge of the realities of life. People often marvelled at the practical ability of one who had been all through his life a student and a writer. He was ardent, imaginative, and easily aroused to enthusiasm, but by no means liable to be carried away by his emotions. He had a strong sense of reality, especially that complex reality which is so difficult to interpret, and which we call human personality.

Much could be said of his importance as a student of religion; he won a world-wide reputation in that department also, but his special strength as a research-worker was primarily due to his unparalleled capacity for depicting very clearly the individual characteristics of various types of religion and piety. His flair for recognizing personal characteristics was also evident in the intercourse of daily life. He possessed an incredible aptitude for summing up a man's character in a felicitous phrase, and his quick glance could anticipate the thoughts of those around him, almost before they were uttered. To understand men is certainly the first qualification for one who is called upon to influence, persuade and govern them.

Few people realize what unprecedented efforts, what intense exertion of his exceptional adaptability and insight were needed to reconcile the many conflicting opinions, and to disperse fruitless opposition during the preparations for the General Synod. But he was successful, and one realized that he must inevitably succeed, when one saw him moving among the motley crowds of foreigners, each of whom was known to him, and getting into touch with them with a word or two; he could win a hearing for himself under any conditions.

Since the days of Birgitta, the Swedish Church has produced no one with such a reputation throughout Christendom as that

possessed by Archbishop Söderblom. Life had, to a certain extent, marked him out for the work of ecclesiastical unification which was to be his great contribution to history.

As a young student, we find him already attending conferences in America, at the side of John Mott. As a pastor in Paris, and as a professor in Leipzig, he learned to understand the soul of two civilized nations. But thoughts of unity and aspirations for peace were not merely the natural outcome of his international outlook; they were more fundamental. It was his Christian conscience that spoke : and that deeply-rooted love of his fellow-men, which believed all things, and hoped all things. To Frederick the Great, a full understanding of humanity could only result in an utter contempt for it. To Söderblom's Christian way of thinking, to know and to understand was to love.

If a fault might be found in him, it was his inability to punish, to condemn, to react against uncalled-for interference aimed at himself as a result of the work he had accomplished. He believed absolutely in the power of goodness to conquer all that was wrong in the world. It is sad to remember how often he had to suffer for his faith.

Great artistic gifts were included in his many-sided temperament. An artist should be able to express himself through his works. A man playing a beautiful melody does not care to play to an empty room. Söderblom had a certain power of imparting an artistic setting to his life and his prominent position. He succeeded, indeed, in his endeavour to attract attention to his work, but it would be a gross misconception to accuse him of straining after effect. It was perfectly natural with him, an instinct which formed part of the equipment for his office. Communicative and approachable as he was, there were depths in his being known to few even amongst those nearest to him. That unfathomable and hidden *something* which undoubtedly exists in all really great men, was not wanting in him.

But those who knew him best, knew that his life was based upon a deep, strong, and unchangeable faith. They know, also, that they have never found in any other individual such a harmonious, courageous, and consistently faithful exemplification of the Christian ideal as that manifested in the life of Nathan Söderblom. Not for centuries has his like been seen in the Church of Sweden.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

By THE EDITOR.

The American Church and Marriage Problems.

Although the Church of England authorities appear to have taken up a *non possumus* attitude towards the reform of our marriage and divorce laws, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has faced the situation with a happy combination of courage and wisdom, by passing at its fiftieth triennial General Convention, recently held in Denver, a new Marriage Canon (No. 43). This Canon runs as follows:

Of the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony.

Section I. Ministers of this Church shall, within their cures, give instruction, both publicly and privately, on the nature of holy matrimony, its responsibilities, and the mutual love and forbearance which it requires.

Section II. Ministers of this Church shall conform to the laws of the State governing the civil contract of marriage, and also to the laws of this Church governing the solemnization of holy matrimony.

Section III. (1) No minister of this Church shall solemnize any marriage before the following conditions have been carefully complied with:—

(*a*) He shall ascertain by due inquiry the right of the parties, according to the laws of this Church, to contract a marriage.

(*b*) He shall instruct the contracting parties as to the nature of holy matrimony, its responsibilities and the means of grace which God has provided through His Church.

(2) There shall be at least two witnesses present at the solemnization of the marriage.

(3) Every minister shall, without delay, formally record in the register the name, age and residence of each party. Such record shall be signed by the minister who solemnizes the marriage, by the married parties, and by at least two witnesses of the marriage.

(4) No marriage shall be solemnized by a minister of this Church unless the intention of the contracting parties shall have been signified to the minister at least three days before the service of solemnization.

Section IV. If one party to a marriage so grievously offend the other, that the security of permanence of the home is imperilled, it shall be the duty of the offended party to lay the matter before a minister of the Church; and it shall be the duty of such minister to labour that the parties may be reconciled.

Section V. No minister knowingly, after due inquiry, shall solemnize the marriage of any person who has been or is the husband or the wife of any other person then living, from whom he or she has been divorced for any cause arising after marriage.

Nor shall it be lawful for any member of this Church to enter upon a marriage when either of the contracting parties is the husband or the wife of any other person then living from whom he or she has been divorced for any cause arising after marriage.

But this Canon shall not be held to apply to the innocent party, in a divorce for adultery, provided that, before the application for such remarriage, a period of not less than one year shall have elapsed after the granting of such divorce; and that satisfactory evidence touching the facts in the case, including a copy of the court's decree and record, if practicable, with proof that the defendant was personally served or appeared in the action, be laid before the ecclesiastical authority, and such ecclesiastical authority, having taken legal advice thereon, shall have declared, in writing, that, in his judgment, the case of the applicant conforms to the requirements of this Canon; and provided, further, that it shall be within the discretion of any minister to decline to solemnize any marriage.

SECTION VI. (1) Any person whose former marriage has been annulled or dissolved by a civil court may apply to the bishop or to the ecclesiastical court, constituted by Canon, of the diocese or missionary district of the said person's domicile, to have the said marriage declared null and void by reason of any of the following impediments to marriage :—

(i) Consanguinity (whether of the whole or of the half-blood) within the following degrees :
  (*a*) One may not marry one's ascendant or descendant.
  (*b*) One may not marry one's sister.
  (*c*) One may not marry the sister or brother of one's ascendant or the descendent of one's brother or sister.
(ii) Lack of free consent of either party.
(iii) Mistake as to the identity of either party.
(iv) Mental deficiency of either party sufficient to prevent the exercise of intelligent choice.
(v) Insanity of either party.
(vi) Failure of either party to have reached the age of puberty.
(vii) Impotence of either party undisclosed to the other.
(viii) The existence of venereal disease in either party.
(ix) Facts which would make the proposed marriage bigamous.

(2) The Bishop in each case, after taking legal advice thereon, or the ecclesiastical court proceeding in accordance with the Canons and acting through the Bishop, shall render judgment in writing to the petitioner. All judgment rendered under this Canon by the Bishop or the ecclesiastical court shall be made matters of permanent record in the archives of the diocese or missionary district.

No such judgment shall be construed as referring in any way to the legitimacy of children or the civil validity of the former relationship.

(3) Any person whose former marriage has been annulled or dissolved by a civil court and pronounced null by the Bishop may be married by a minister of this Church as if he had never previously been married.

SECTION VII. (1) If any minister of this Church shall have cause to think that a person desirous of Holy Baptism, or of Confirmation, or of receiving the Holy Communion, has been married otherwise than as the Word of God and discipline of this Church allows, such minister, before receiving such person to these ordinances, shall refer the case to the Bishop for his godly judgment thereupon.

The Bishop, after due inquiry into the circumstances, and taking into consideration the godly discipline both of justice and of mercy, shall give his judgment thereon in writing.

> Provided, however, that no minister shall in any case refuse these ordinances to a penitent person in imminent danger of death.
>
> (2) Any persons who have been married by civil authority, or otherwise than as this Church provides, may apply to the Bishop or to the ecclesiastical court of their domicile for the recognition of communicant status or for the right to apply for Holy Baptism or Confirmation.
>
> After due inquiry into all the facts relevant there, judgment shall be given in writing to the petitioners by the Bishop or by the ecclesiastical court acting through the Bishop.
>
> In case of a favourable decision, a minister of this Church may, at his discretion, bless the parties to the union.

This Canon comes into effect on January 1, 1932. Although some will regard this Canon as a triumph for Liberal Churchmanship, it is really something of a compromise. It is not the Canon proposed by the Commission which has been sitting for some years past. That Canon, which involved a drastic liberalization of the Church's practice, was withdrawn in favour of the one passed. The new Canon agrees with the American Church's practice which permits the re-marriage of the innocent party. It also adheres to that Church's practice in regard to divorce, but its provisions for the annulment of marriages for a number of specified reasons is a distinct advance. It leaves to the diocese the option between the Bishop as the sole judicial authority and the constitution of a diocesan court. Moreover it makes the restoration to communicant status of a re-married divorced person definitely legal. At the same time, the new Canon exhibits a proper regard for the conscientious scruples of those clergy who feel bound to adhere to the old rules, and permits them to decline to do what the new Canon allows. This concession, however, will not obstruct the action permitted by the new Canon, as there are a large body of clergy in the American Church who are strong supporters of the new legislation and they will carry it out in practice.

Modern Churchmen have no desire to see the standard of Christian marriage lowered; they have no desire to see the State adopt a definitely secularist attitude towards marriage. They believe that marriage ought to be a life-long union of the two parties married, and everything should be done by Church and State to promote that ideal; but they are equally convinced that to allow no exceptions in certain intolerable cases is to sin against Christian love and to be guilty of an inhumanity which they cannot feel has the sanction of Christ. We could wish that our English Church authorities had the courage, wisdom, and

humanity to follow the example of the American Church. Inaction seems to us in this matter to be condemned by the words of Jesus, 'Woe unto you lawyers also! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers.'

An English Eucharistic Eirenicon.

The following document dealing with Eucharistic doctrine in the Church of England was published in the *Times* of October 7, 1931:

> Acknowledging that, inasmuch as God is Love, the Life of God the Son, alike in the eternal sphere and in its earthly manifestation, is a life of self-giving to the Father, we believe
>
> (1) that our Lord, on the eve of His Passion, instituted the Sacrament of Holy Communion in remembrance of Himself and for the special commemoration of His death, and that the Church has therefore been right in regarding the Eucharist as the most sacred act in her worship—
>
> (2) that the Lord, who has promised to abide for ever with His Church, is Himself the real minister in every Sacrament, using by the operation of the Holy Spirit the visible acts and audible words of an earthly minister—
>
> (3) that the Consecration is the act of the unseen Lord, in response to the liturgical prayer and action, taken as a whole, in which the officiating priest and the worshippers alike have their share—
>
> (4) that such Consecration has a real effect, since the consecrated elements are by the will of God now charged with a new spiritual significance and purpose, being the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ—
>
> (5) that, while the Consecration passes into effect in virtue of the Divine Will and the intention of the Church as a whole, the benefit of reception is dependent upon the faith and dispositions of the worshipper—
>
> (6) that the Divine Liturgy constitutes one whole, in which the reception of the sacred elements forms an essential part—
>
> (7) that the celebration of the Liturgy shows forth our Lord's Sacrifice as that which has, once for all, reconciled the world to God—
>
> (8) that our Lord's Sacrifice, which reached its climax at Calvary, was completed by His Resurrection and Ascension, whereby His incarnate life was carried forward into the unveiled presence of the Father, thus establishing a new relation of mankind to God—
>
> (9) that the virtue of our Lord's Sacrifice was made available for us through the coming of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, when the Church became the agent of His redemptive purpose—
>
> (10) that as the risen and ascended Christ is ever with the Father as the Royal High-Priest of mankind, so at the Lord's Table we celebrate and make before the Divine Majesty the Memorial which He has willed, becoming thus united with our Lord in His Sacrifice, which sustains the new moral and spiritual order prepared for redeemed humanity—

and we affirm that the faithful use of the Lord's Supper can alone reveal its inexhaustible meaning, and that in the unity of experience we shall draw nearer to unity in belief.

This document, drawn up as the result of a Conference initiated at King's College, London, has received the public support of a notable collection of signatures representing the Anglo-Catholic, Evangelical, and Modernist schools of thought.

Its publication was accompanied by the following letter from the Archbishop of York addressed to the Rev. H. T. Knight, Vicar of Shortlands, Kent, who played an important part in the production, signing, and publication of the eirenicon :

BISHOPTHORPE, YORK.

October 5th, 1931.

DEAR MR. KNIGHT,

I am most interested in the agreed statement which has been drawn up and in the representative list of names which have been secured in support of it. What you have done is a magnificent sequel to the movement inaugurated at the King's College Conference over which I presided. I most heartily welcome this statement and the degree of genuine common conviction which it represents.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM EBOR.

As Modernists we are keenly desirous of unity within the English Church, but we are quite unable to feel the enthusiasm manifested by Dr. Temple for this particular contribution to that desirable end. Had the signatories put forth a declaration stating that they were firmly resolved to obey the Prayer Book rubrics regulating the Communion Service, and were also wholeheartedly resolved to give all the support in their power to those who, like the Bishop of Birmingham, are doing all in their power to secure such obedience, we should have felt real gratification. The road to unity in this matter at the present time is the road of obedience to the Prayer Book. Clergymen of the most varied views as to the nature of the Eucharist can all promote unity in this troublesome sphere by maintaining liturgical uniformity within the wide limits allowed. Had the signatories wished also to exhibit their agreement in Eucharistic doctrine they might have published their signatures in affirmation of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as set forth in our Church Catechism, which is as lucid as it is authoritative.

Our first objection to the document that they have signed is that it secures the semblance of unity by ambiguity. A number

of its clauses cover a multitude of interpretations. Our second objection to it is that where it is clear what it sets forth is neither the teaching of the Reformed Church of England nor of our Lord. For instance, what authority have we for saying that 'the visible acts and audible words of an earthly minister in every Sacrament' are the Lord's, and that 'the Consecration [of the Elements] is the act of the unseen Lord in response to the liturgical prayer and action.' There is no petition in our authorized Communion Service praying the Lord to consecrate the Elements. In the Holy Communion we may note that the prayers are all addressed to the Father, not to the Son. Futhermore, the stress laid by the document on the Consecration of the Elements is quite alien to the spirit of our English Communion Service. This stress is mediaeval. The statement that 'at the Lord's Table we celebrate and make before the Divine Majesty the Memorial which He has willed' is one of those ambiguities which probably was not recognized by the Evangelicals and Modernists who signed the document. The word 'memorial' is not ἀνάμνησις (*anamnesis*, remembrance, which St. Paul records Jesus as using in the Institution of the Eucharist, but μνημόσυνον (*mnemosunon*), which has the meaning of a memorial sacrifice by which the offerer was commended to God. This introduces into the English doctrine of the Eucharist not only something which our Lord never taught, but which our Reformers sought to exclude from the English doctrine of the Eucharist.

We do not find it congenial to offer public criticism of a well-intentioned effort, but we think it a profound mistake that those who believe neither in 'the Miracle of the Mass' nor in 'the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass' should have signed a document which can be interpreted as teaching both those doctrines.

Mechanistic mysticism seems to us to be the chief ingredient in this document, and although in certain clerical circles it may 'go down like bottled velvet,' yet it has no medicinal value for the ills from which our Church is suffering. It is not all thinking alike or even all speaking alike about the Eucharist which is the remedy, for that cannot be achieved. What is needed is loyalty to the practice of the Church of England, and our authorities are very far from having secured that.

A MODERN CHURCHMAN'S CREED

By the Rev. ARCHIBALD ROBSON, M.A., Vicar of Hemel Hampstead.

THE Creeds of the Church present a difficult problem to Modern Churchmen. Few of us would agree with Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's *dictum*:

> 'I do not think creeds have any effect. Character is everything; belief is nothing.'

This sort of talk is prevalent, but I think we feel it is very cheap. The real belief of a man is the faith by which he lives; and if it be at all possible for him to define this faith, he has gained a very precious thing by its definition. We have learnt from Socrates that we never understand anything rightly until we have defined it, and a Creed which should be a real definition of the faith by which a Christian man lives, would be a treasure of altogether inestimable value.

Have we such treasures in the three historic Catholic Creeds which the Church of England accepts?

There are devout Churchmen who most certainly regard these creeds as of inestimable value. They command their loyalty and their devotion. They are for them the standards of their Church's faith. Dr. Bethune Baker tells us in his book, *The Way of Modernism*, that 'our Creeds are rather dull things. There is nothing of the Passion of Faith about them.' But quite certainly there are many who do passionately treasure and defend and love them.

Let me cite but one instance of this 'Passion of Faith' which the Creeds arouse in the hearts of some Christians. I remember once, not many years ago, I was summoned to the sick bed of an aged and saintly clergyman, who had done heroic work in East London during some forty years of a devoted ministry in a parish by the Docks. As I went to his house, I wondered how best I should minister to him. But I need not have wondered. When I went into his bedroom, the old saint settled this question for himself; he went straight to the heart of his religion; he said to me, 'Say the Creed; say the Creed.' I repeated the words of the Nicene Creed; and when I had ended I heard the old man

say, 'In this Faith I have lived; in this Faith may I die.' Certainly there was the Passion of faith in this man's recitation of the Creed. And I am very sure that he is representative of many, to whom the Creeds are sacred standards of their Faith, and are passionately loved.

We are bound to ask ourselves: How does this passionate love of the Creeds arise?

I believe it has come to most of those, who are possessed by it, because these Creeds have been for them part of the worship in which their religion has found expression. They are an integral part of our historic Christian worship. Dr. Lietzmann tells us that they owe their primary origin to the natural desire of Christian men to proclaim before God the truths which underlie their worship. He goes so far as to say that it is in the repetition of the Creed that the celebration of the Sacraments reaches its climax of emotion, though I think few of us would agree with him here. He denies that the Creeds arose as a defence of the Church against heresies. 'If there had been no heresies, yet there would have been Creeds.' It is in the desire men have to proclaim their Faith before God and man that the Creeds have their origin, and it is in their worship and as an integral part of their worship that this proclamation of their Faith is made.

At least I think it is true that most of those Christians who repeat the Creeds with a thrill of ardent devotion associate them with the emotion of adoration which they have experienced as they have offered their worship to God. It is in their liturgical worship that they have satisfied their instinct of adoration; and the Creeds have been an integral part of their liturgical worship.

But there is another psychological cause of men's devotion to the Creeds. There are those who feel that in repeating them they are linking themselves with the Church of the Ages, the Catholic Church. They take up the torch and hand it on. There is nothing that has greater power over the hearts of men than this instinct of tradition.

Yet another cause may be found for the devotion with which men regard the Creeds. They believe that, whatever may have been their primary origin, at least they have served to safeguard the true faith of Christian men against fatal heresies. And there is truth in this. Dr. Atkins, in his *Making of the Christian Mind*,

reminds us that the Creeds were formulated during those centuries in which the Church was in danger of being entangled in that web of fanciful speculation to which we vaguely give the name of Gnosticism.

> 'Here was an issue so profound that there was for the Church no choice but to fight it out. Of this struggle and of the victory in this struggle the Nicene Creed is the monument.' 'One enormous thing,' writes Dr. Atkins, 'got itself accomplished. God was not to be separated from His world by an abyss to be crossed only by a cloud-built bridge of speculation. Humanity was not to be left spiritually orphaned. There was a living Way between the human and divine, and Jesus Christ that Way. He was one with the Father in consubstantial Deity, and one with man in an actuality of human experience, which was no shadow at all but flesh of our flesh and pain of our pain.'

Here was indeed something vital to our Christian Faith. Can we wonder that Christians have treasured and still treasure the Creeds that secured it to them?

And yet, when all this has been admitted, when we have taken into account all these factors which have made the Creeds precious and sacred, there is also something else of which we cannot but take account.

We live in a day when a new learning has become, or at least is fast becoming, the possession of the mass of men in all civilized countries. There is a new *Welt-ansicht*, a new scientific outlook and a new historical knowledge. In the Catholic Creed it is an older learning, an older cosmology, which find expression, and this older cosmology means nothing to educated men now. They are not so much in revolt against it, as possessed by a new learning which leaves no place for it.

And it is the Church's clinging to the phrases which belong to the old learning which repels men from her worship. 'Our religion,' writes Dr. Bethune Baker, 'ought not even to seem to harbour bits of obsolete history . . . and science.'

In our Creeds there are phrases which are so obsolete as to be well nigh meaningless to the modern mind. They belong to a cosmology which is pre-Copernican, and it is now literally impossible for most of us to think in the terms of this pre-Copernican cosmology.

In his *Garden of Epicurus* Anatole France summed up the situation which has arisen out of this revolution in our mental outlook.

> 'We find it hard,' he writes, 'to picture to ourselves the state of mind of a man of older days who firmly believed that the Earth was the

> centre of the Universe and that all the heavenly bodies revolved round it. He could feel beneath his feet the writhings of the damned amid the flames: very likely he had seen with his own eyes and smelt with his own nostrils the sulphurous fumes of Hell escaping from some fissure in the rocks. Looking upwards he beheld the twelve spheres: first, that of the Elements, comprising air and fire: then, the sphere of the Moon—of Mercury, of Venus—which Dante visited on Good Friday in the year 1300: then those of the Sun, of Mars, of Jupiter, and of Saturn: then the incorruptible Firmament wherein the stars hung fixed like so many lamps. Imagination carried his gaze further still, and his mind's eye discerned in a remoter distance the Ninth Heaven, whither the Saints were translated to glory, and finally the Empyrean, Abode of the Blessed, to which after death two angels robed in white—as he steadfastly hoped—would bear his soul, as it were a little child, washed by baptism and perfumed by the oil of the last Sacraments.'

That was the old cosmology of the Catholic Church: it has disappeared from men's minds.

> 'We are done now,' writes Anatole France, 'with the Twelve Spheres: the solid vault of the Firmament is cleft asunder. Our eyes and thoughts plunge into the infinite abysses of the heavens. Beyond the planets we discover, instead of the Empyrean of the elect and of the angels, a hundred millions of suns rolling through space . . . Amidst this infinitude of systems our sun is but a bubble of gas, and the Earth a drop of mud . . . Worlds die—for are they not born? Birth and Death are unceasingly at work. Creation is never complete and perfect; it goes on for ever.'

It is this new knowledge which has with its wonder and romance captured the minds of the younger generation. Can we be satisfied in our churches simply to go on repeating the phrases of our old theology. The Dean of Chester truly tells us that it is one of the conspicuous weaknesses of our religious teaching that we have one set of thought-pictures for our religion, mostly inherited, and another sort of thought-pictures for science and for subjects of general knowledge, mostly native to our own generation or its immediate predecessor.

There is a divorce between our theology and our science: it is hard for the minds and hearts of men and women of our day to reconcile them. They cannot but think in terms of the science of their time.

And there is to many of them a yet greater difficulty. The great Broad Churchmen of the nineteenth century brought to men's minds the gentleness and love of Christ, and in this gentleness and love of Christ the Revelation of the Ultimate Truth of the Universe, the Revelation of the Pity and Mercy of its Creator, the God who declares His Almighty Power most chiefly in showing Mercy or Pity. This is our Faith in God.

But there are clauses in the Athanasian Creed that are no less irreconcilable with this Faith in the Mercy and Pity of God than they are with our modern scientific thoughts of the universe.

'He ascended into Heaven; He sitteth at the right hand of the Father, God Almighty; from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead; at Whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies; and shall give account for their own works; and they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.'

This is not *our* modern interpretation of the Faith of Christ. It is the theology, it is the science, and it is the morality, of a Medievalism that has no power over the hearts and minds of most men to-day. In greater or less degree, none of the ancient Creeds can be the true expression of our living Faith in God.

Perhaps we may ask: Could we reformulate these ancient creeds? Could we so reformulate them as to make them truly and adequately express our Faith?

It is, I think, impossible. The ancient Creeds are of their own day, and their day is not ours.

We must retain them as historical formularies. The conservatism of the Church will retain them in use for very long. There are many congregations which will desire to retain them in public worship. As I have insisted, there are many saintly men who treasure them.

But I think we may at least claim a place in our Liturgy for a Creed that shall more adequately express the Faith of Modern Churchmen.

Experience shows us that the well-known Modern Churchman's Creed makes a true appeal to the young, to whom we teach it in our Confirmation Classes. Many of us believe that it would worthily express the devotion of a worshipping Church, gathered at the Eucharist. It is a religious Creed. It concentrates our thoughts on the truths that lie at the root of our religion, our Faith in God. It leaves untouched such questions as that of the Birth of our Lord of a Virgin Mother. Such questions interest us, perhaps; but they mean little to our working Faith, our Religion. In this Creed I find the Faith by which we live:

> 'We believe that God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

'We believe that God is Light, and that if we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

'We believe that God is Love, and that everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

'We believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that God hath given to us eternal Life, and this life is in His Son.

'We believe that we are children of God, and that He hath given us of His Spirit.

'We believe that if we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

'We believe that the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but that he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever. Amen.'

It is a beautiful Creed: it is full of the spirit of the Christian religion.

And yet, is there perhaps one clause that might be added? The fundamental doctrine of a Christian's faith is the truth of the Lord's Resurrection. I venture to suggest that it should have its place in this Creed. If I may say it with deference, it seems to me that the Creed that makes no mention of it is defective. We Christians live by faith in a Living, Risen Christ, our unseen Friend to whom we pray, our Heavenly Lord to whom we give our Adoration. This is our distinctive faith.

I would suggest then that there be added to the Modern Churchman's Creed one further article—the fifth in the series of its articles—such a sentence as this from St. Peter's great Epistle:

'We believe that God according to His abundant Mercy hath begotten us again unto a living hope by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.'*

*We welcome Mr. Robson's addition, but if it be thought best to adhere to Johannine language, then we suggest the additional clause should be made in the following manner.—Ed. *M.C.*

A Modern Churchman's Creed.

We believe that God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

We believe that God is Light, and that if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

We believe that God is Love, and that everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

We believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.

We believe that He is the Resurrection and the Life and that whosoever believeth on Him, though he were dead, yet shall he live.

We believe that we are children of God, and that He hath given us of His Spirit.

We believe that if we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

We believe that the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever. *Amen.*

ULRICH ZWINGLI

1484—1531 A.D.

OF every ten English people who know something of Martin Luther, probably not two know anything of Zwingli. Yet Zwingli was Luther's greatest contemporary in the Protestant Reformation in German-speaking lands.

He was a German-Swiss of peasant origin, born in the hills of the Toggenburg. As a boy he once asked whether a lie should not be more severely punished than a theft: even then he showed his love of country by endeavouring to excel in all arts and knowledge, that he might serve it the better. He was sturdily built, ruddy, generous, and an accomplished musician.

On completing his studies in the scholastic method of his time, he became, in 1504, priest in the little town of Glarus. Here the Humanist movement kindled him, and he studied the Greek classical writers, Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Pindar. He corresponded with Erasmus and began to realize that the Gospels, not traditional theology, were the source of real religion. As chaplain he served in Italy with the Swiss mercenaries, and saw clearly how the system of selling their services had corrupted his countrymen. They earned gold, but learned to despise honest work.

His opposition made him powerful enemies, for foreign intrigue was lucrative not only to soldiers but to politicians, and they got him transferred to the Benedictine Abbey of Einsiedeln. Here he had access to a fine library in which to continue his studies. He now began, as he says, to preach the Gospel of Christ. He had as yet no thought of leaving the Church of Rome.

In 1519 he was called as people's priest to the Minster of Zürich, after Berne the chief town in the Swiss Confederation. He preached every week in the market against mercenary service and the war spirit. Men sat at his feet who had not been to church for years. He spoke straight to them in his homely dialect. About this time he first heard of and was deeply influenced by Luther. The plague brought him nigh to death, and a new sense of humility marks his conversion.

Zürich, which had been a home of every vice, now became, in his words, 'a noble Christian city.' The councillors and magistrates supported him: morals were regulated: the seductive ritual of the Church was put aside. Public disputations won the city to submit to a theocracy. This was bound in time to bring about a reaction. Bishops, abbots and religious foundations had their interests to protect. In 1523, at the invitation of the City Council, Zwingli put forth his position in sixty-seven theses: the chief of these declared the Mass to be not a sacrifice, but a commemoration of Christ's sacrifice and an assurance of redemption. Luther, it may be recalled, believed that the Body of Christ is present in the consecrated elements, just as heat is present in hot iron. These theses marked the definite break of Zürich with Rome. Zwingli himself had already married.

From 1524 to 1529 Zwingli was at the height of his power. Church property was secularized: beggary was controlled: hospitals and schools were established. His influence was felt in Germany, Holland, Belgium, France and Italy. His works were translated into English and French: they were put on the Index in Louvain.

The breach with Rome was followed by trouble with the Anabaptists, who were repressed harshly. Their fanaticism was due to their own interpretation of the Scriptures. So too was the rising of the peasantry, who rebelled against the tithes they still owed to the new Church. But Zwingli, himself by birth a peasant, understood them and honoured their calling, and they were met by conciliatory measures.

Far greater danger menaced from the Inner or Catholic Cantons of Switzerland, who felt themselves threatened in their religion and in their mercenary interests. They allied themselves with Austria and the German Catholics, while Zwingli designed a counter-attack with the aid of Berne and other Protestant cities. In 1529 the hostile forces met at Kappel, on the frontier of the Canton of Zug, but a peace, little more than a truce, was arranged: there was still a deep sense of brotherhood among the members of the Confederation. Zwingli deplored this postponement of vital issues: 'When they are ready they will not spare us, and then no one will make peace.'

Remarkable as it may appear to us, during these years the two Protestant parties, Lutheran and Zwinglian, had been engaged in bitter controversy. In the same year (1529) a last effort was made at Marburg to reach a common confession. On all but one of fourteen points they agreed. But Luther would not depart from his literal conception of the Eucharist, while Zwingli dared not go back on his own teaching. Luther would not even accept him and his as brethren.

Meanwhile the Emperor and the Pope were plotting the destruction of all Protestants. Zwingli attempted an anti-Hapsburg European alliance, which came to nought. Rendered desperate by a blockade of their supplies, the Inner Cantons marched swiftly towards Zürich, and the opponents met once more at Kappel. It was a veritable Flodden Field for the aristocracy of Zürich, whose forces were unready and ill-equipped. Zwingli himself, bearing the banner, clad in mail, with battle-axe and sword, was struck down and his helmet shivered. As he lay dying among the insults of the enemy, he refused confession. One Catholic priest on the field, to his honour, mourned him as a patriot. The Lutherans exulted shamefully at the news of his death.

Thus fell Zwingli, in his 48th year, on the 11th October, 1531. He had been engaged in great endeavours: the abolition of mercenary service, the curbing of the oligarchies, the uniform establishment of the evangelical faith. His work appeared to be shattered; the Papacy recovered its ground. His failure was due largely to his not realizing that the Cantons were not prepared for the sake of the Protestant faith to break up the Confederation. But von Ranke holds that his work and influence survive him in the positive Protestant spirit which still distinguishes his city and canton. By 1530 his teaching had spread to two-thirds of the German-speaking part of the country. At the present day more than half the population of Switzerland is Zwinglian, or is, at the least, deeply influenced by the tradition which he established. He believed in reason as the clue to life, and in truth as a living force which must inevitably triumph. For his conception of truth he lived and gave his life.

H. Alexander Clay.

WHY I CROSSED THE RUBICON

NO Roman Catholic is anxious to risk excommunication; often those who are the most concerned about their faith are the ones who love their Church so dearly that, whilst wishing to preserve all that is essentially true in its doctrine, they seek to purge it of all that is vitiating and superstitious in its tradition. But because, in the estimation of the Papacy, the terms Roman Catholic and Modernist are in direct opposition, any endeavour to present the Gospel, such that it is as capable of standing the test of modern learning as it is of witnessing the love and wisdom of Christ, meets with no warmer encouragement than 'Non licet esse vos' and no happier fate than the ban of anathema.

Thus Cardinal Mercier wrote: '*La doctrine révélée n'est pas pour le philosophe et pour le savant un motif d'adhésion, une source directe de connaissance, mais une sauvegarde, une Norme Négative. Au moment où il procède à ses enquêtes, le philosophe chrétien peut donc, en toute liberté interroger la nature ou sa conscience et suivre la direction de la raison. Mais s'il lui arrive que ses conclusions se trouvent en désaccord avec la Révélation telle que les autorités légitimes la lui proposent à croire, il doit, dans l'intérêt et de sa foi et de la vérité scientifique, reprendre ses enquêtes jusqu'à ce que les difficultés se résolvent dans l'accord des enseignements, qui à première vue, semblaient se heurter.*'

Yet even in a religion so theologically absolute as Roman Catholicism, it is not difficult to detect the spirit, if not always the conclusions, of Modernism, for wherever the human mind has sought to bring new light on old problems, there the spirit of Modernism has been working. Tradition and the strong arm of authority may have blighted its development, but one seems to see something of its spirit in the Patristic use of Hellenistic philosophies and in the mind of St. Thomas Aquinas when, with the most temerarious daring, he 'baptized' Aristotle. In the case of Erasmus that same spirit engendered a desire to eradicate, by ironical exposition, the clerical abuses of his day, and it stimulated the studies of Melanchthon. And Green, the his-

torian, saw its fruits when he wrote : 'The awakening of rational Christianity, whether in England or in the Teutonic world at large, begins with the Florentine studies of John Colet.' In fact, wherever the Church has produced a thinker, she has produced, in temper if not in practice, a Modernist.

Fortunately, in England the difference is not so marked. Usually, on the one hand we have a mind, training in certain first principles, deferring intellectually to the canons of ultimate belief laid down by a school of theologians who centuries ago established a 'one-way system' of 'thought-traffic,' and generally content with a supernatural explanation of the universe; whilst on the other hand, we have a mind, much less positive, sympathetically disposed towards truth, wherever it may be found, a little incredulous, perhaps, of supernatural explanations, finding its religious experiences in unadorned worship and simple fellowship, rather than in esoteric pious practices and constantly readjusting itself to changes wrought by new knowledge and newly-defined values. In England, with 'clericalism' reduced to a minimum, the Roman Catholic is something of a Protestant, by association and contact. As Cardinal Newman wrote :

> 'Independent of instruction on the part of Superiors, there is a sort of self-education in the academic institutions of Protestant England; a characteristic tone of thought, a recognized standard of judgment is found in them, which as developed in the individual who is submitted to it, becomes a twofold source of strength to him, both from the distinct stamp it impresses on his mind and from the bond of union it creates between him and others — effects which are shared by the authorities of the place, for they themselves have been educated in it and are at all times exposed to its ethical atmosphere.'

The Roman Catholic, in this country, is at all times exposed to such an atmosphere and influence, because it is the product of something inherent in the English character; however firm he may be in his allegiance to his Church, however sure in his convictions, the mould of his mind and his habits of thought will be those rather of the New Learning than the Old Faith. The Modernist here, then, can find a unique medium in the national Church for strengthening the subjective reaction to his vision of truth. For a religion which is not afraid to express its belief in modernity, in the ability of the human race to move forward and 'grow in grace and wisdom,' and one, moreover, which does not offer hemlock to every Socrates within its communion can assuredly command a great future. Only a few have had the

temerity to cross the Rubicon, and though it is difficult to realize what sacrifice is entailed on the part of the Roman cleric who dares to secede, yet few of those who have won release from an anodyne of quietism look back after putting their hand to the plough which breaks the ground to spiritual emancipation.

How is it possible to repudiate the politic discipline and doctrinal accretions of Rome? Not necessarily, as that Church contends, in the leading of a sinful and dissipated life nor in the neglect of Christian duties, nor in indolently acquiring Christian doctrine, nor in assuming an attitude of intellectual pride, nor in the deception of irreligious books, nor in ecclesiastical 'muck-raking.'

Two things are necessary:

(1) A disposition suitable for the perception of Divine truth.

(2) The frank resolve to examine without recourse to blind faith resting on authority, the teaching of Scripture. So few ever get to the initial stage, that, *a fortiori*, few get beyond.

What powerful words, then, and what clear argument can break the spell which Roman Authority casts over all who yield obedience to it? Writing from a strictly personal experience, I would retort.

Consider the declaration of those brave men who, in 1909, made Modernism a defiant swan song.

> 'Through a series of causes, which we need not enter into here, Catholics seem to have lost every elementary sense of responsibility and personal dignity. Instead of being met with a service of reasonable and therefore discerning obedience, the acts of their supreme rulers are received with the unconscious acquiescence of irresponsible beings. This reacts unfavourably on the exercise of authority itself, which loses sight of its proper limits and true functions and transforms itself into an absolutism inconsistent with that reasonable spiritual government instituted by Christ, in whom we have passed from servitude to freedom.'

And again:

> 'We are weary of seeing her (the Church) reduced to a sterile force, which, notwithstanding an apparent grandeur that wins the facile and unintelligent adulation of the multitude, acts as a brake to social progress; to an institution which squanders its vital energy in idly dreaming of what it used to be in days gone by.'

Such a religion undoubtedly suits not one, but many types of mind. That irrepressible young man, Aldous Huxley, remarks in one of his essays that it suits every type but that which loves liberty. Unhappily, the Roman Catholic is not aware that he is not free:

> 'We are limited,' says Cardinal Manning, 'by Divine Revelation to believe in the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation and the whole dogma of Faith: yet we are not thereby slaves, but free men. We are redeemed from doubt and error and from that which is both at once, from the guidance of the blind, the theology of human teachers, by the presence of a Divine' (*England and Christendom*).

The Roman Catholic who would be free can break a lance in favour of liberty of thought and conscience by reading for himself, against an accurate, in place of a traditional background, Holy Scripture. The truth of Dr. R. F. Horton's words will become apparent:

> 'Catholicism represents a traditional growth, a system which, in its government, its theology, its moral teaching, its worship, its ideals, its practice, its priesthood, its method of work, its influence in the world, affords an almost incredible contrast to the book which yet, by a strange inconsistency, it still calls inspired and authoritative.'

Out of these considerations, I have felt compelled to lay down allegiance to the Mother Church of Christendom, not in any embittered mood, nor with any lack of gratitude for an ecclesiastical training, with its consequent appreciation of spiritual values, but rather in that frame of mind which sees a new vision. For in the quiet charity of the English Church, may be discerned a fellowship and an inward grace divorced from hard ecclesiasticism and bringing the Kingdom of God straight to the heart.

> 'Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
> When a new planet swims into his ken,
> Or like stout Cortez, when with eager eyes
> He stared at the Pacific, silent upon a Peak in Darien.'

For there are two great Churches of Christ. In one of the Free Church booklets, Dr. Horton, quoting from the *Hibbert Journal*, described the one:

> 'The Papacy is, and will be for long a force in politics. It can command votes, it can effect combinations; it impresses the imagination, it bulks large before the world. But it is a declining power. The stars in their courses fight against it; the forces which are making history are on the other side. Silently and ceaselessly they work. Like a majestic iceberg, detached from some arctic continent, it moves southward from the polar ocean, a fragment of a dead world. Ghostlike, a peril to mariners, it towers over the waters that wash its base; its peaks glitter in the sunlight; its cliffs reflect the blue of sky and sea. And all the while the process of undermining is going on; the frozen mass encounters kindlier currents; the temperature rises; a little sooner, a little later maybe, there can be but one end.'

However that may be, whether Rome rises or declines, the Church that is Catholic and yet Protestant, humble in its pre-

tensions yet mighty in its appeal will continue its mission. A Church that is capable of reform is capable of progress, and being capable of progress it is capable of change without loss.

Summing up, then, it is contended that Rome has driven from her Communion some of her most virile champions by an ultramontane policy and an uncompromising front. In countries exclusively Roman Catholic, Protestant worship, even at its best, does not suit the Latin temperament; hence liberal thought is either crushed from the beginning or becomes merely secular. In England, however, I see no reason why the English Roman Catholic, who has the courage of new convictions, should not accept Protestantism, because its expression in the English Church represents the peculiar genius of the English people. A thorough understanding of Roman Catholicism, both from the lay point of view and the ecclesiastical, impels me to urge that it is a gigantic machine, grinding out with sweated labour and toll of human life and liberty, the fabric of medievalism; its compensations can be acquired only by dulling the intellect and surrendering mind and body to its service. It can bring happiness in a measure; but it is not a rational happiness, because with the passage of time its teaching becomes more supernatural and more dogmatic: already within the last hundred years we have been given the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility. It is now generally admitted that at the next summoning of the prorogued General Council of the Vatican, we shall have the dogma of the bodily Assumption of the Virgin defined as *ex cathedra*.

It is comforting and quiescent to work out one's salvation under the direction of a confessor and to the mystic pageantry of the Mass. There is a solemn beauty in prayer before glimmering candles and flowered shrines, and almost at times the special pleading of some saint lifts the soul to heights not attainable save through the channels of Roman Catholicism. But it is a better thing to lift up the mind and heart directly to God, to feel His Kingdom within and to gain his grace in a religion of service, simplicity of mind and heart and the wise use of the faculties He has given us for attaining His truth.

WM. CAVANAGH, JR.,
Honours Prizeman, 1929, in Mental Philosophy, Mount Melleray Seminary, Waterford.

MARK PATTISON (1813—1884)

By the Rev. E. J. Martin, D.D., Chaplain of Ripon Training College.

IN 1872 'a distinguished Oxonian' gave the following opinion:

> 'Jowett has a touch of genius which Pattison has not; otherwise, taking him all round, Pattison is the first man in Oxford.' [1]

The narrator of this anecdote adds his own comment that he would consider Pattison 'the first clergyman of our time.' The word 'clergyman' is an unexpected one. But we can safely say that Pattison was a remarkable man and one who lends distinction to the Church that could keep him as one of its officers. At the end of the nineteenth century he was something of a legend in Oxford. To-day anyone who turns to the posthumous volumes of his *Essays* will be rewarded with some very penetrating thinking and some very pointed writing. Those who turn to his *Memoirs* will find a masterpiece, a book of similar type and covering similar ground to Newman's *Apologia*, but by every standard a better book because a completer psychological study, written not in the subjective passion of self-defence but with the detached realism of Gibbon. The *Memoirs* end with the year 1860, and at the time of their publication (1885) minor omissions were thought desirable. Diaries of some at least of the later years survive. So far nothing from them has been printed. Tuckwell, whose entertaining *Reminiscences of Oxford* give one of the most kindly and understanding sketches of Pattison, has probably touched the spot when he says that the fatal flaw in his character was a lack of sympathy. He had suffered in the early days from what we have learnt to call an inferiority complex, and he spent his later life putting mankind in its place.

Pattison was born in 1813 at Hornby, near Bedale in the North Riding of Yorkshire, and passed his boyhood in the neighbouring village of Hauxwell, parishes of which his father was successively incumbent. Educated at home, he went up to Oxford, to Oriel, as a commoner in 1832, an uncouth boy who found difficulties in his new environment which he had never expected. 'I who had come up to Oxford,' he says, 'a mere child of nature, totally devoid of self-consciousness . . . developed a self-consciousness so sensitive and watchful that it came be-

[1] L. A. Tollemache, *Recollections of Pattison* (London, 1885), p. 69.

tween me and everything I said or did.'[2] He failed to get a First Class in his Final Schools, a disappointment which he took, as he took all rebuffs, as the end of all things. Eventually he got a Fellowship at Lincoln College (1839), where he spent the rest of his life. In 1851 he failed to secure election to the Rectorship of the College owing to a series of discreditable intrigues. Again he took defeat badly. He was elected at the next vacancy in 1861. After he became Rector of Lincoln he married Emilia Strong, daughter of Major Strong of Oxford, a lady of great intellectual gifts. She was twenty-two and the Rector forty-nine. Pattison lived the life of a scholar until his death in 1884. He had acted as member of a Commission on Education in Germany in 1858, and ten years later embodied his views on Universities in his *Suggestions on Academical Reorganization* (1868). The only other books he published during his lifetime were his *Life of Casaubon* (1875) and his *Milton* in the English Men of Letters Series (1879).

Pattison went up to Oriel the year before the Oxford Movement started. His contact with Newman in the College brought him into the centre of the Movement. To the end of his life, so far as he permitted himself affection and admiration, Newman was the one friend for whom his more tender feeling never died. They neither met nor corresponded, but Wilfred Ward has revealed in his *Life of Newman* how Newman visited Pattison on his death-bed. They had met but once since 1845, and now Newman was over eighty and Pattison was seventy.

> 'The result of the visit will no doubt be asked for, but it will be in vain; for the Cardinal was not the sort of person to say much on what was so grave, so anxious and so private as this, the result of which must be in the hands of God. Nevertheless what he did say was expressive of satisfaction and of hope.'[3]

From 1840 to 1842 Pattison had been one of Newman's closest intimates. With his passion for self-torment he has copied into his *Memoirs* pages from the diary he had kept in those days. He had noted down how he recited the Breviary and had made his confession to Pusey.

> *Monday, 3rd October* (1843). . . . Silence not literally observed gives way to necessity. Began Moehrer *On Unity*, French translation. Read Wharton's preface to *Anglia Sacra*, vol. ii. St. Remigius transferred to-day. . . .[4]

[2] *Mem.*, p. 49.
[3] Ward, *Life of Newman*, II, p. 483.
[4] *Mem.*, p. 193. The scene is Newman's retreat at Littlemore.

St. Remigius transferred to-day. So the Pattison of 1880 looks back forty years, not to smile at the ritual enthusiasms of youth, but to make himself seem contemptible in his own eyes. When Newman passed over in 1845, Pattison retraced his steps. How far he retreated no one has ever discovered. Henceforth church activity plays little part in his life. He sometimes preached before the University. In 1860 he contributed to *Essays and Reviews* the most valuable paper in the collection. He had little other official contact with religion.

It is always difficult to submit the religious opinions of anyone to analysis. With Pattison the difficulty becomes almost an impossibility in the face of his sardonic determination to protect his feelings by blackening his past. We can usually find in a character we approach with any degree of sympathy some reflection of our own mental condition. Thus Tollemache found in Pattison a kind of agnosticism that is too vague and trivial ever to have been Pattison's. Frederic Harrison made public the famous phrase in which Pattison spoke of the idea of Deity being 'defecated to a pure transparency,' but he does not seem to have interpreted what was in Pattison's mind. Pattison said many sardonic things, as when he defined orthodoxy as 'Stoicism plus a legend.' On the other hand, Tollemache was surprised to find that to the end of his life he refused to abandon faith either in Theism or in Immortality. Others who knew him believed that the secession of Newman cost him more than he ever admitted.[5] One fact of religion he did see, the force of the plea of another Oriel man:

> Then God of truth for whom we long,
> Thou who wilt hear our prayer,
> Do thine own battle in our hearts
> And slay the falsehood there.

He served the God of Truth with undimmed devotion, and English religion still owes him a debt. He was one of those who made it possible that in the best theological circles to-day theology no longer means the formal rearrangement of dogma but serious historical and philosophical inquiry. From almost any page of his writings it is possible to gather fruit:

The Method of the Church of Rome.

> It locks up virtue in the cloister and theology in the library. (*Essays*, II, p. 87. 1860.)

[5] Tollemache, *op. cit.*, pp. 76 and 30.

The Anti-Modernist.

To traduce critical inquiry as scepticism or rationalism, to hound on the mob to hunt down the small handful of clergymen who have dared, however, unskilfully, to put their hand to theology, is the absorbing passion of a party which once sat at the feet of Newman. (*Ib.*, p. 277. 1863.)

The Preacher.

The church is not merely a temple of worship but a school. When the organ is hushed and the congregation silent and the teacher ascends the pulpit, then the weak side of Anglicanism reveals itself. (*Ib.*, p. 293.)

The Teacher.

The Church party speaks of all that a clerical writer utters as 'teaching.' . . . As if there were no such thing as discussion or learned research; no unexplored fields in historical criticism; as if the relation of the theological writer to his reader was that of spiritual guide and the public sat at his feet to receive dogma. (*Ib.*, p. 301.)

Authority.

May she (*i.e.* the Church of England) never take the fatal step of standing upon authority instead of upon reason, upon intellect, upon education, upon the spiritual and moral cultivation of the soul. (*Sermons*, p. 136. 1865.)

Loving God with the Mind.

May it not be said that all Christian communities are pervaded by a sentiment of jealousy towards intelligence, as something not wholly good in its nature? It is thought . . . that a life of intellect is in its essence a looking in any other direction than that of God and heaven. (*Ib.*, p. 139. 1867.)

Revelation and Reason.

The attempt to settle the apparent conflict between reason and revelation by declaring revelation to be non-rational is renewed from age to age. The history of opinion teaches us that the attempt to erect a Christian altar to the Unknown God is always made with the greatest plausibility at epochs like the present, when the accumulation of new knowledge is in active conflict with old forms of thought. (*Ib.*, p. 188. 1869.)

On his contribution to Essays and Reviews.

So wholly extinct is scientific theology in the Church of England that the English public could not recognize such a thing as a neutral and philosophic inquiry into the causes of the form of thought existing at any period. (*Memoirs*, p. 314.)

The recurrent subject even of his sermons, however, is Education. 'The thing of first necessity to me,' he says, 'was a definite direction to reading, so that reading might become serious study, study might become research, and, if it might be, literature might become learning.'[6] He has given more than once his general theory of Education.:

[6] *Mem.*, p. 310.

> A Christian life is the true philosophy and it can be communicated from teacher to disciple in only one way, by the contagion of example. Education is weak in proportion as it detaches the matter taught from religious training, strong in proportion as it rises to discern their true unity. (*Sermons*, p. 99. 1863.)
>
> Education is an abridged experience. Education is to the facts of life what language is to mental operations. It enables us to represent the absent as present, to see with the eye of the mind circumstances and situations which have never come within the scope of our personal observation. (*Ib.*, p. 107. 1865.)
>
> Mind is a reagent against society, a personality counteracting organization, a judgment exercising a dissolving force upon received opinion. As such it presents itself at the first aspect simply in the light of a dangerous enemy; it must be the interest of society to extinguish it. And it can be extinguished. All are stronger than some — the many than the few. Organization is an over-match for detached effort. But the surest mode is not by force but through education. You have only to pronounce education complete when the disciple has run through its first phase to turn out the *perinde ac cadaver*, the lifeless machine man of the Jesuit schools of the seventeenth century, with his varied accomplishments, his circumscribed understanding, his dead will and fanatical temper, his literary fertility, and his barrenness of idea. (*Ib.*, p. 109. 1865.)

For University Education in particular he laid down in his *Suggestions on Academical Reorganization* in 1868 the principles of his life. To him a University was a place of research and pure learning. To his contemporary Jowett it was a training place for life. Pattison held that the aim of University education should be cultural and not vocational. Professional studies like law and medicine should be post-graduate. 'For general purposes special studies should never entitle to University honours inasmuch as for those purposes they have no value in and for themselves and only derive it from their being the substratum for philosophy.'[7] The historian of Lincoln College, Andrew Clark, says that Pattison's idea of the College was to get rid of the undergraduates and replace them by a few genuine students who should give their lives to research. On the morning after the appearance of Class lists, if there was no Lincoln First, he would say with evident pleasure, 'What's the College coming to? Another Class list and no First from Lincoln.' If the College did secure a First, the Rector's comment was, 'What's the Class list coming to? There's so-and-so got a First.' Yet he did work as College Tutor that was notable even among the work of College Tutors. He was, in fact, one of

[7] *Essays*, I, p. 490.

those who created new ideals of tutorial work. During the period of his greatest disappointment (between 1851 and 1861) it is said by his pupil, R. C. Christie,[8] that his work was as stimulating as ever; neither his interest in his pupils nor their success in the Schools suffered.

His sketch of the spirit of Youth in 1863 sounds like some of the evidence that reached Lambeth in 1930:

> The insatiable appetite for amusement—the craving for variety—for constant succession of excitement—labour shrunk from—the restraint of attention felt as an intolerable annoyance — study as an irksome drudgery — pleasure itself sought with listlessness not with passion, while day after day runs down the same easy round of sauntering comradeship, such are some of the symptoms of the soft self-indulgent spirit which attends the diffusion of wealth and civilization. On such a soil we could not hope to grow the hardy fruit of independent judgment, of an informed and disciplined intellect. (*Sermons*, p. 93.)

In Pattison's day the stream of Education was narrow; it reached comparatively few, but it had some claim to depth. Since his day the stream has advanced like the Dee, growing wider and at the same time shallower. The Utilitarian ideal has steadily prevailed. The aim has been to give Education a cash value on the market. What Pattison expected from Education was 'the hardy fruit of independent judgment, of an informed and disciplined intellect.' The cheap newspaper and the popular sermon to-day are evidence of how little Pattison's ideal has been achieved. But not only that. The quotation already given on standardized education would be as applicable to the facts of much English education to-day as to the Jesuit ideals of the seventeenth century. A very large proportion of those entrusted with education may pay lip-service to other ideals, but what they like is a system that will impress on the pupil the outlook of the teacher and on the teacher the outlook of average colourless opinion. 'Teaching to think' is an ideal that finds no readier a welcome in secular spheres than in those of theology.

Pattison lived to pursue knowledge of the truth. His aim even prevented him from publishing the results of his search. His *Essays*, which are an education, liberal in both senses of the word, were collected only after his death.[9] They nearly all

[8] In DNB. This was also the opinion (in conversation) of Fowler, afterwards President of Corpus, who had been a Fellow of Lincoln from 1855 to 1881.

[9] A selection was collected after his death by Henry Nettleship. 2 vols. Oxford, 1889.

fall into two groups, one concerned with scholarship and scholars, the Stephenses, Muretus, Joseph Scaliger, Huet, and so on; the other with the eighteenth century, Religious Thought in England 1688-1750, Bishop Warburton, Pope and his Editors. Nothing Pattison ever did is better than the examination of Religious Thought in the first half of the eighteenth century, which was originally contributed to *Essays and Reviews*. Its thoroughness, lucidity and appreciation show how much Pattison might have done in the field of religious philosophy and history, if he had not preferred the less attractive (and it might almost be said less valuable) task of investigating the history of Education in Europe. The two works published in his lifetime are widely separated parts of a plan hardly even sketched.[10] His *Life of Milton* was written to order for Macmillans' English Men of Letters Series on the suggestion of the Editor, John Morley, an old pupil of Pattison's. Its interest for Pattison no doubt originated in Milton the educationist rather than Milton the poet. His largest work was to have been a life of Joseph Scaliger, fragments of which were among his papers. The merits of the published *Sermons* rest almost exclusively on their discussion of the fundamental problems of education. There is thus a unifying principle behind the whole of Pattison's life and writings. His entire outlook was without any utilitarian end. He saw Education as an end. Even his purely literary work has provoked conflicting opinions. While Tuckwell describes his attitude to Milton as that of a scholiast,[11] another opinion has classed his *Milton* as 'almost the best book in the E.M.L. Series.' In view of his belief in the value of original thought, the standard of preparation which he thought necessary to any undertaking is startling. He was probably only mildly ironical when he advised one friend to spend twenty years in preparation before attempting to edit Selden's *Table Talk*, and he told Creighton that no man could write history without an adequate library, and an adequate historical library meant spending at least £1,000 a year (mercifully he did not suggest the number of years). Few seem to have penetrated past that

[10] *Suggestions on Academic Organization* (1868) and *The Life of Casaubon* (1875).

[11] He was probably thinking of an annotated edition of Milton's Sonnets which Pattison contributed to Kegan Paul's *Parchment Library*.

sardonic exterior. Two little facts hint at something beyond. One was the death-bed meeting with Newman. The other is that at least one man regarded him not only with respect but also with genuine affection, and that was his college scout.

THE MODERNISM OF BARTHIANISM

By the Rev. R. Birch Hoyle, author of *The Teaching of Karl Barth,* etc.

BISHOP WESTCOTT once wrote: 'That truth is most needed which runs counter to current tendencies of thought.' This is but another way of saying *audi alteram partem.* The article by Mr. Harvey in the January issue on *Barthianism and Modernism* provoked the thought that Barth and Brunner, the foremost writers of the new school of German-Swiss theology, are more modern than Mr. Harvey would lead his readers to think. Indeed, part of their attraction to some minds is due to the fact that they are equipped with the best methods of modern technique, whether in Biblical criticism, philosophical analysis, or the latest psychological theories, and apply these methods fearlessly in their 'corrective theology' to the dominant tendencies in theology to-day.

In Biblical criticism, Rudolf Bultmann, an adherent of this school, is one of the foremost exponents of the *Formgeschichte* method of analysing the Gospel narratives, whilst E. Brunner told the Fundamentalists at Dayton, Ohio, that he was

> 'an adherent of a rather radical school of Biblical criticism which, for example, does not accept the Gospel of St. John as an historical source and which finds legends in many parts of the Synoptic Gospels.' (*Theology of Crisis,* p. 41.)

And Barth frankly admits that

> 'the Christian Church and Christian theologians must permit historians to have their say concerning what they have full right to say to the Biblical text.' (*Dogmatik,* p. 346.)

In philosophical criticism they are experts, for all the problems of 'the theory of knowledge,' by means of their training in the neo-Kantian discipline of Marburg, they have thoroughly mastered, and their starting-point is an intense realism which

attacks idealism root and branch. And the psycho-analysis of Freud they know well. Brunner, for example, declares that

> 'what psycho-analysis has to say about religious experience is of no little importance. It at least points to an often forgotten truth . . . that faith is no mere theory . . . but a *passion*. We may thank psycho-analytical investigation for showing us man as a unity, as an indissoluble entity of mind, soul and body. It has destroyed the old Platonic antithesis of body and mind upon which idealism rests.' (*The Word and the World*, pp. 76 *f.*)

The new humanism which attacks the Christian view of man has no foe so formidable as the Barthian theology.

There are other grounds for the welcome their theology has received. For one thing, it has been hammered out on the anvil of pastoral experience. Barth, Thurneysen and Gogarten found that their theological training in Ritschlianism, under Herrmann, had no 'glad tidings' for congregations in the present unrest and uncertainty of mind induced by the relativism of modern thinking and the practical difficulties of living the Christian life in modern industrial conditions. The staple of preaching with such a theology rove thin. Modern theological science had a slender hold on God, a defective sense of sin and its corresponding attenuation of the need of salvation. Whatever else the Barthians may have missed, they have made the questions of a living God and His relation to man and the cosmos the burning-point of theological thought once more. Revelation is their central theme, and the relation of revelation to the word of Scripture becomes again the focal centre of discussion, with the necessity of going back to the Bible and comparing it, as witness to revelation, with the religious books of other religions. This appeals to the ingrained reverence for the Book of Books the Anglo-Saxon race feels. To an age full of scepticism and disillusioned by the late war as to the innate nobility of man, they come with the Biblical certainty of a Living, Speaking God and a message of hope for sinners in the valley of Achor. As a trenchant American critic admits,

> 'Whatever their success, they have compelled the Christian world to face the crisis between God and man, sin and salvation, the here and hereafter. God is God: man is man. These antitheses are thundered forth as never since the days of the Old Testament prophets. . . . The outstanding merit is the emphasis on God as Creator and the Christian religion as a supernatural, transcendental order through the revelation in Christ Jesus.' (A. S. Zerbe, *The Karl Barth Theology*, pp. 261, 271.)

Even as regards modern science this school is not antagonistic. The Bishop of Birmingham, in his able sermon before the British Association, said: 'The task of Modernism or of advanced Protestantism is clear. We have to make a satisfactory synthesis of man's religious inspirations and the conclusions of modern science.' Brunner accepts those conclusions.

> 'The Biblical world-view, cosmological and historical, has gone for good,' he says. 'We know that the world was not created a few thousand years ago, but that we have to reckon with billions of years, and even so do not reach the end. We know that the history of our earth, although counting its millions of years, is one of the recent events in the history of the universe. It is a well-grounded hypothesis that a more or less continuous pedigree traces the origins of humanity far back into the animal sphere. We know that there never was a paradise on earth with Adam and Eve and the serpent; we know that most of the Old Testament pre-history is mythology, not history, and that there is no unbroken chain of witnesses from Adam and Noah to Christ. But more, the picture of New Testament history too has undergone profound changes; we have come to see the important differences between the Synoptic, the Pauline, and the Johannine tradition. We have learnt that, from the standpoint of history, the Fourth Gospel, as compared with the Synoptics, is much inferior, and even the Synoptic tradition is very unreliable and full of contradictions.' (*The Word and the World*, pp. 98 *f.*)

Elsewhere he says:

> 'There are scientific leaders who no more come in conflict with their faith through this scientific work than did the man of antiquity with *his* view of the world. It is quite possible to be a Biblical Christian with the new world-view, say, with the teaching of Darwin, Einstein and Planck, as it was to be religious with the Babylonian three-storeyed universe. What is antagonistic to faith is not science, but the idea that science is the ultimate and only truth, the mania of science, the scientific illusion and its underlying philosophy. . . . The reconciliation of Christian faith with modern science is not a first-rate theological problem; *the* theological problem as well as *the* Church problem is this — to deliver modern man and the modernized Church and theology from the illegitimate self-sufficiency of reason and the spirit of autonomy.' (*Ibid.*, p. 126.)

'Illegitimate'! Then there is a 'legitimate' self-sufficiency of reason! It is at this point that some, like Mr. Hardwick (*vide Modern Churchman*, April, May and June), appear to go astray by their emphasis upon the *irrational* element in the Barthian view. It is unfortunate that the German word *irrationalismus* is so often translated as 'contrary to reason.' In German philosophy it is the equivalent of supernaturalism, transcendence. For example, Külfe, in his *Introduction to Philosophy*, defined it thus:

> 'The name of supernaturalism, or irrationalism, is given to the standpoint which posits super-rational realities (unattainable by the light of human knowledge, but known by a special function of faith or presentiment or intuition) or an equally super-rational source of knowledge (revelation).' (p. 187.)

Otto himself has called attention to the vagueness in the use of the term *Irrationalismus*:

> 'Writers shirk the trouble of putting down precisely what they intend by the term, giving it the most multifarious meanings and applying it with such vague generality that it admits of the most diverse interpretation.'

He instances the empirical in contrast to reason, the psychological in contrast to transcendental fact, what is known *a posteriori* as against what is determinable *a priori*, impulse and the obscure forces of the sub-conscious as opposed to reflection and an intelligible scheme, mystical depths, intuition, prophecy and 'occult powers':

> 'All these,' he says, 'and more may claim the names "irrational," "non-rational," and according to circumstances are extolled or condemned as modern irrationalism.' (*Das Heilige*, Eng. Trans., p. 60.) [1]

Now Brunner, far from denying the place of reason in relation to faith, distinctly allows it scope. He says:

> 'It would be the worst conceivable service one could render to attempt to take faith out of the realm of the "super-rational" and to seek it in the biological, emotional, volitional and semi-mystical. The "super-rationality" of faith is to be found, not in the absence, but in the realization, of the laws of the questing spirit, the spiritual as such. It is not miraculous in so far as it is unconscious, but in so far as it is first of all the complete consciousness.'

And further:

> 'That "supernatural" datum, that a truth is suspected because it is already acknowledged as such, and that one's feeling of discovery is accompanied by pleasure, as if the discoverer were a prophet,'

is to be acknowledged. For

> 'The weightiest thing in thinking, the direction of thought, is something super-rational. . . . It is undeniable that "all philosophy that understands itself" leads into the vicinity of God, but it is just as undeniable that this last step it cannot take of itself.' (*Erlebius, Erkenntius und Glaube*, 1923; pp. 115-120.)

When reason stops short, God comes in as 'revealer' to faith:

> 'In this super-rationality of spirit-existence our likeness to God consists. The "spiritual" must be construed as real and the real as spiritual. . . . In maintaining this two-foldness, in the humble reverential relating of itself to the Spirit-Beyond (*Geist-jenseits*) consists both the spiritual and "irrational" character of faith.' (*Ibid.*, p. 125.)

[1] *Cf.* Dr. Harvey's letter, *M.C.*, June, pp. 166 *f.*

And 'Faith, transcending both mystic immanence and gnostic transcendence, . . . seizes that which lies beyond all empirical possibilities (a transcendentalism from the You-side). . . . In this paradox nothing else comes to expression than the primal mystery, the "super-rational," that the Spirit subsists, that here thought and reality are the same, that in the matter of spirit-existence we have to do, not with ideas, but with the fact that all ideas point to an ultimate Real . . . a personality who is not merely thought of, but with whom we can intelligently come into vital union.' (*Ibid.*, p. 129.)

So far at any rate as Brunner is concerned (we say not *Barth*) reason has not been lost by man's 'fall.' Here he differs from Barth. Indeed, Brunner wrote:

'If man could not question after God, then there would be no salvation for him; then he would be inaccessible for the Word of God. . . . Man is not a log and a stone, but just man, and that is to say "a being somehow knowing about God." His knowing about God is his human-being, however marred and questionable also this knowing is.' (*Zwischen den Zeiten*, 1929; pp. 262, 264.)

It is not in the reason pure and simple, but in the 'will,' that man's sinful fatality lies. And here Brunner and Barth are at one with such a Modernist as the late Aubrey Moore. He said:

'The religious view of man and his relation to God carries with it a sense of human insufficiency and the correlated truth of our dependence on Him who is the source of truth. . . . But against this view our pride rebels. We want to be creators or discoverers, not receivers of truth. . . . We would fain be complete in ourselves, sufficient of ourselves, able to stand alone. And the very pride . . . which by advancing knowledge and a higher general morality has fortified itself in the citadel. Yes; the offence of the Cross has not ceased. For Christ upon the Cross is the continual reproach of the proud.' (*Essays, Scientific and Philosophical*, 1890; pp. 258 *f.*)

It is at this point that we come to the strength of the Barthian criticism of current 'humanistic' views of man's nature. Man not only seeks to know God; he seeks to be forgiven by God. As Brunner says:

'Forgiveness is the word which more clearly separates the Biblical from the philosophical knowledge.' (*Gott und Meusch*, p. 20.)

And Dr. Kenneth Mozley speaks truly when he says:

'This is quite clear: Barth's doctrine is first of all a doctrine of Christ the Redeemer.' (*Mysterium Christi*, p. 184.)

He adds:

'If we bear in mind the sharpness of the contrast which he draws between the transcendent God (*deus absconditus*) and weak, creaturely, sinful man, and along with that his conception of the life of Jesus as "the place of atonement determined from eternity in the counsel of God, and now, in time, in the sight of men, brought within history,"

> we realize that in Barth's Christology, Jesus must be one who comes from God to humanity, not one (merely) who best represents humanity's aspiring efforts God-ward.'

We have no space to discuss the difficult problems raised by Barth's views on 'the hidden God' and the 'infinitely qualitative difference between God and man,' or the peculiar Christology of the Barthian school. It would take up more than one number of this magazine to present and criticize their 'position.' But it is only just and right to recognize that they do not claim to have a 'system of theology.' We need to remember that Barth entitles his chief theological work 'Prolegomena to Christian Dogmatics,' and we should wait till he has further elaborated his views. He rightly complains that critics have not centred on his main thesis, *viz.*, man's inability to save himself without a revelation, a personal confrontation of himself with the God who speaks as 'Thou' to the human 'I.'

> 'I miss in my critics the consideration that our knowledge and apprehension is really merely patchwork, that we have not the resources to reach absolutely satisfactory conclusions concerning God. The famous "Corrective" they have not taken to heart at all as yet.' (*Zwischen den Zeiten,* 1926; p. 36.)

In the same context he allows that 'the so-called Barthian theology will go one day as it came.' Indeed, there is a growing change of emphasis to be traced in his successive writings. We hear less of the 'altogether Other' God than we did in his *Romans*. Brunner too, in his latest work, 'written to remove misunderstandings which confront the Dialectical Theology,' says that 'neither Barth nor I nor any other member of our group has conferred on it this title. Our only possible name for it would be "the Theology of the Bible," or "Christian Theology."' He admits the title was not inapt, that the dialectic is that of Kierkegaard, not Hegel, and justifies the language of paradox. He says:

> 'It is only by means of the contradiction between two ideas—God and man, grace and responsibility, holiness and love—that we can apprehend the contradictory truth that the eternal God enters time, or that the sinful man is declared just.' He concludes: 'What happens to the "Dialectical Theology" is of no consequence: but on what that theology *means* there hangs nothing less than the salvation of the world.' (*The Word and the World,* pp. 6-8.)

And that salvation, and how it comes, is the kernel of their message:

> 'It comes not from but into history, not from but into human reality, which in itself cannot produce but only long for it. Hence the New Testament, in describing what was given through Jesus Christ, uses only such words as express *discontinuity* with all that man has apart from Christ. Darkness—light, death—life, perdition—salvation, judgment—grace, guilt—forgiveness, sin—redemption. This discontinuity, these pairs of antitheses, are not . . . a peculiar fact of dialectical theology, an expression of its one-sidedness, and a result of its determination to get a hearing. This discontinuity is the stumbling-block, the kernel of the Gospel: it is the one thing that the New Testament wants to say. And he who thinks away this discontinuity and these irreconcilable antitheses, thinks away the Gospel from the New Testament.' (*Ib.*, p. 48.)

In the difficult work of making a synthesis between man's 'religious aspirations and the conclusions of science,' this school will see to it that the Biblical-Reformation views of man's creation, fall and redemption, however much of it may rest on myth and fragmentary narratives, shall have their due weight of consideration. Their modes of thinking, criss-crossing from Yes to No; their delight in posing Either-Or's in paradoxical fashion, so disconcerting to the British love of compromise and the *Via Media;* their resistance to the sceptical method of questioning and hypothesis which are the mark of much of the scientific investigator, and their insistence on faith as the condition and 'cavity' into which revelation may be brought; their resting of faith in the Divine Revelation itself and not in any supposed faculty of man, in 'the speaking God' and not the receiving man; their protest against the scepticism and abstractness of much current thinking which would reduce God to a mere projection of our human wishes, or see 'evolution,' 'process,' or a compact of 'space and time,' or 'the social consciousness,' or 'the *élan vital*, or 'the principal of concreteness' as substitutes for or descriptions of God: above all, their realistic view of man's sin and need, and emphasis upon the fact that God speaks to man and redeems him—all these features entitle them to a patient hearing and show them to be moderns of the modern while proclaiming that Word of God which is man's highest possession because God's gift and man's one 'sure word,' that 'Divine Word' Socrates yearned for, on which to 'risk the voyage of life and take our (last) journey more surely and most securely.' (Cf. *Phaedo*, 85.)

THE IMPATIENCE OF A PROPHET

By the Rev. G. L. H. Harvey, M.A., Rector of Sutton Coldfield.

IN Dr. Raven's *Jesus and the Gospel of Love*, under which title he publishes his Alexander Robertson Lectures, delivered this year in the University of Glasgow, he summarizes and develops the position reached in his previous writings. His book incarnates the spirit of Modernism. Dr. Raven is an adventurer, eager and courageous, prepared at all costs to pursue his vision of truth whithersoever it may lead him. His eagerness indeed not infrequently betrays him into a generous impatience, so that, if the plagiarization were allowed, this book might well bear the sub-title, *The Impatience of a Prophet.*

> 'It is hard to keep one's equanimity,' he writes, 'when in dealing with matters of importance one is deftly tripped up by a text from the Old Testament or a quotation from the Thirty-nine Articles. "Devil take the Bishop's horse and you too," exclaims Cauchon to de Courcelles, and a similar imprecation is hard for the apologist to repress when, having grasped a clear issue, it is interrupted by his colleagues, who insist that the real crux is the Virgin Birth or the doctrine of the Trinity.'

The primacy of truth over tradition is for him a principle which demands unswerving adherence. The first disciples of Christ in the new light which had come to them revolutionized the ideas of God and reality current in their own day. As they were true children of their day, so should the modern believer be a true child of his own day. 'For it is as men of our own day sharing with our contemporaries the modern outlook upon the world and upon humanity that we must approach the Son of Man; that is the apostolic method; following it His disciples revolutionized current ideas of God and reality.'

Like the first disciples, Dr. Raven takes his start from the Jesus of history who, he is assured, may be truly known to us to-day. Though He defies analysis, He is, Dr. Raven holds, known to us more vividly than any other figure of history. The discrepancies in the New Testament pictures of Jesus are, in his view, trivial as compared with the solid mass of consistency. To

**Jesus and the Gospel of Love*, by Charles E. Raven, D.D. (Hodder and Stoughton, 1931, price 15/- net.)

the canonical Gospels he assigns early dates. S. Mark he puts at 58 A.D. or earlier, S. Luke at 61-63 A.D., and S. Matthew at 65-69 A.D., while he holds that the Fourth Gospel was written in his old age by the Apostle John, and is 'a true interpretation of Jesus by one who knew Him in the flesh.' It is impossible here even to summarize the arguments which lead him to these conclusions. They are in the main those already familiar to the student in the writings of the more conservative Biblical critics presented anew with great freshness and persuasiveness. Of his arguments in favour of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that they are pressed with something like passion, whereas less than justice is done to the difficulties. In particular his treatment of the problem raised by the alleged resuscitation of Lazarus is far from satisfying. But though his dating is conservative, there is no lack of freedom in his treatment of the Gospels. For instance, he considers that 'Matthew, apart from the skill of its condensation and the beauty of its myths, is of importance mainly as showing how soon and by what changes Christianity was transformed into a legal and ecclesiastical religion.' On his theory we have to adapt ourselves to a very marked foreshortening of the accustomed perspective of ecclesiastical development.

'If Jesus existed and was what the students of Him proclaim, then,' urges Dr. Raven, 'a universe that could produce Him cannot be explained without primary reference to Him.' Such was the conviction of the first believers, the result of their 'experience' of Jesus. Dr. Raven adopts the works of Nietzsche to describe revelation through an experience of this kind. It is 'the sense that something which profoundly convulses and upsets one becomes suddenly visible and audible with indescribable certainty and accuracy.' This experience, 'the true mysticism,' as Dr. Raven calls it, according to him happens 'when the wholeness of personal life is seized upon by a transcending and irresistible power, a power other than the self, yet akin to it and able to possess and use it.' It may not be explained away by analytical methods 'which are always and inevitably defective since they can only describe the whole in terms of its parts,' whereas the whole, merely by being a whole, is greater than the sum of its parts. The test of the validity of such mystical ex-

perience is enrichment of life, a strengthening of the will, and an ennoblement of character. Yet, though 'experience' is Dr. Raven's 'blessed word,' he is fully conscious of the dangers which attach to an uncritical appeal to experience, and sees clearly that 'to base the defence of religion upon direct personal experience is an easy method of recovering the influence of the priesthood and removing matters of faith from the realm of argument.'

> 'Christians resisted the suggestion that their faith was illogical when that suggestion was urged upon them by Mr. McCabe or Mr. W. H. Mallock; they accepted it with avidity when Dr. Otto invented the magic word "numinous" and in his protest against Liberal Protestantism made unreasoning awe the essence of religion. There is a very real danger that the desire for experience may open the road to subjectivism and delusion, and that the interest in mysticism may foster an exaltation of the pathological. Already we hear it argued that the validity of cultus or doctrine can be proved sufficiently by the power to arouse devotion, an argument which if pressed would justify any pious fraud of Alexandrian thaumaturgy or mediaeval priestcraft.'

The only real safeguard against such perversion would seem to be a philosophical criticism more radical than Dr. Raven would be prepared to accept. Such criticism has been applied by Dr. Tennant in a chapter of his *Philosophical Theology* with results by no means congenial to Dr. Raven's thought. Dean Rashdall, who stated that he did not know a single proposition about God which is not asserted by some mystics to be self-evidently true, by others to be self-evidently false, reached much the same conclusion as Dr. Tennant. The fact is that to form a right and balanced judgment we need the help of the accurate terminology and the disciplined thought of the philosopher. Rhetoric and metaphor, the use of such phrases as 'the eye of the soul,' tend to confuse the judgment, and especially so when we are under the spell of an eloquence so compelling as that of Dr. Raven.

Dr. Raven sees in Jesus a unique creative influence, a revelation of God. It was through Him that the first Christians gained a new and vitalizing vision of God, the universe and man. 'Christianity came into the world proclaiming that God and man were one in Christ, that He was "the light that lightened every man" and that "as many as are led by the Spirit are sons of God."' A large part of his book is devoted to a powerful development of the thesis that the subsequent religious decadence was fundamentally due to a growing tendency to conceive the

human and divine, the natural and the supernatural, as essentially disparate. It was a tendency inherent in Hellenistic thought and was reinforced by the deepening gloom which descended on the dying Empire. It was a tendency which explains the vast difference between 'the serene and joyous naturalness of Apostolic Christianity and the hell-haunted, sin-obsessed ascetic supernaturalism of the fifth century.'

> 'Jesus has faded and become a luminous ghost, radiant still, but no longer of this world. His brightness only serves to darken the shadows of earth. If He has put on majesty, if we can still wonder and worship, it is the majesty of the ancient gods, an intrusion of the supernatural, not a revelation of the true character of the natural . . . His incarnation is a theophany: He is not of our species: He belongs to the realm of mythology, of the dreams and nightmares of men whose lives are spent in fear.'

This perversion of primitive Christianity, this growing emphasis on a radical dualism between the human and divine, brought Christology to a deadlock. It was in reality quite inconsistent with any true Incarnation. It coloured the whole organization of Western Christianity.

> 'If the Hellenistic Jesus is the Lord of the gnosis, the Jesus of Rome is Lord of the *Civitas Dei*. As King of kings He is head of the heavenly host, angels and archangels, saints and virgins, and of the hierarchy on earth, the successor of St. Peter, the bishops and clergy . . . He is still Man in name: in fact, whether God or man, He is a name and little more, a name of magic power for those who can control its influence, but a name signifying only the doctrines, laws and cultus of the Church.'

Over the whole of the Middle Ages the curse of this perversion of the religion of Christ continued to hang. The character of Jesus has lost its appeal. 'The Jesus of history has become the Christ of mythology.' Dr. Raven discusses at some length its evil effect in the formulation of doctrines of the Atonement which, separating the death of Jesus from His life, envisaged it either as a ransom paid to the devil or as the satisfaction of an angry Deity. Ultimately the Reformation was inevitable. 'Mediaeval Catholicism had failed so grossly as to bring religion into contempt, so obstinately as to compel a drastic remedy.'

But the Reformation did not bring full enfranchisement. The real liberating influence came with the development of German speculative and religious thought, mediated in England through Coleridge and Carlyle and influencing such forerunners of Modernism as Arnold of Rugby and Frederick Dennison

Maurice. Such men, says Dr. Raven, were engaged in the adventure of reinterpreting Christianity in categories unknown since the third century. He himself makes use of the conception of emergent evolution in his attempt to formulate a reasonable Christology. He sees the whole creation moving towards a unity with God, a unity already incompletely manifest at various levels of being. In Christ a new and full unity between God and man emerges, a unity in which we share so far as we have union with Christ.

No Modernist is *only* a Modernist. He is a man who is on the move, and he is therefore necessarily also a Futurist. In his *Jesus and the Gospel of Love* Dr. Raven shows himself to be a true pioneer, a faith-inspired Futurist.

> 'Roman Catholicism,' he writes, 'with its stress upon the eternal, upon orthodoxy and obedience, perpetuates the child's level of growth. The Protestantism that succeeds to it is the revolt of the adolescent in its criticism of authority, its reliance upon intellect, its claim to selfhood and independence. Beyond the institutionalisms and the modernisms of to-day there lies a region which we have hardly yet entered, a region of free and satisfying fellowship unconstrained by external legalisms, undistracted by self-centred empiricisms, a new country of the full-grown who in the unity of the body shall have attained to the measure of the stature of Christ.'

BOOK REVIEWS

A NEW SERIES OF BOOKLETS

There is no more useful work being done to promote the ideals of the Modern Churchmen's Union than that by the Rev. R. G. Griffith, in editing and publishing well-written, thoughtful, helpful booklets dealing with the religious and moral problems of modern men and women. The first series, called the 'What we Believe' series, consisted of twelve booklets issued at one shilling per dozen post free. The second series, called the 'Faith and Practice' series, consists of ten booklets. These, like their predecessors, are sold at a penny a piece or one shilling per dozen post free. They are admirably printed in good type and run from twelve to twenty-four pages each. The titles and authors of the 'Faith and Practice' series are as follows :—

God and the Universe, by Sir Francis Younghusband; *Modern Faith,* by Dr. Coulton; *Modern Discipleship,* by Rev. K. G. Budd; *Public Worship,* by Rev. A. T. Woodman Dowding; *The Sermon on the Mount,* by Rev. R. G. Griffith; *The Use of Leisure,* by Rev. C. F. Russell; *What do you think of Sex?* by Dr. Douglas White; *Marriage,* by Dr. Helena Wright; *Gambling,* by Rev. H. G. Mulliner; *Teaching Religion to Children,* by Dr. Major.

We thought the first series very good, but this second series seems to us more varied and more practical, and Sir Francis Younghusband's and

Dr. Coulton's booklet are of absorbing interest and of great value for educated readers. The two booklets dealing with sexual problems are by competent medical authorities, and are marked by conspicuous courage and wisdom. The booklets dealing with Gambling and Leisure should have a wide circulation. We hope that all who can will place them on the bookstalls in our parish churches. Booklets issued at so low a price demand a large sale. A third series can only be issued if its predecessors have sold well. These publications are on sale at the Modern Churchmen's Union Office, The Church House, Westminster, S.W.1. H.D.A.M.

GOD IN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND EXPERIENCE.*

This book is the first in an interesting series, of which Dr. Matthews himself is one of the editors. Five volumes are published; two more promised. This opening volume deals with God in Christian Thought and Experience, and the implications of the defining clause should be noted by the reader as they are observed by the writer. We have here no general manual of theology but a consideration of the data of Christian thought and experience and a discussion of their relation to philosophy, to science, and to the modern view of the universe. Dr. Matthews believes the continuance of any belief in God to be a 'main question' of our age. He desires to present Christian experience and Christian teaching on the divine nature in such a form and aspect as the reason of modern men may not be compelled to reject. In principle the book rests upon an inductive basis. Changes are recognised and frankly accepted. Not every belief of the past is justified. But in essentials the validity of the Christian experience is maintained and it is held to be not incompatible with the growth of knowledge and our present interpretation of the universe, if we have one.

It is natural, the writer claims, for man to seek after God, and his quest brings him to a Reality at once beyond him and akin. Man's consciousness of God has, of course, grown and developed. It comes to its highest phase in the religious experience which is recorded in the Old Testament and in the New and has its fullest expression in Jesus and his teaching. Theology is the formulation of what is given in religious experience, but theology is no final statement; it assimilates, modifies and even abandons, and transition is notably the mark of our present age. But the ancient doctrine of the divine transcendence is still philosophically maintainable, for neither nature nor history can be understood without it. We are then brought, in an important chapter (viii), to consider personality in God, after which the doctrine of the Trinity is discussed, and perhaps only in this connection do we detect in Dr. Matthews any evident desire not to be thought unorthodox. God is further regarded as the Creator, in which doctrine transcendence and immanence are both implied. The argument then passes to the Love of God and to the relation of this belief to the admitted facts of Evil. A chapter on Time and Providence, suggestive but not claiming finality, closes the book.

Probably the central position of the argument is to be found in a single sentence: 'The fundamental ground for belief in God is the character of human experience' (p. 138). But then, as the writer goes on to allow, it is not every kind of religious experience that must be accepted. Thus there is selection, there is abstraction. The facts considered are chosen for their

* *God in Christian Thought and Experience.* By W. R. Matthews, M.A., D.D., Chaplain to the King, Dean of King's College, London. In 'The Library of Constructive Theology.' (Nisbet & Co., 1931. Price 10/6.)

quality, nor is it denied that in other phases of religious experience God has been found cruel, jealous, indifferent or impersonal. If the question be raised, Why should certain elements in religious experience be allowed a dominance and validity which are denied to others, the answer would be that it is legitimate to judge of any subject by its highest examples, that we measure art or human nature or poetry by the best we know of them and the like criterion is legitimate in dealing with religion. The objection that we have no right to give objective, ontological, validity to an experience largely subjective, that there is risk of 'projecting' our own ideas, desires, and emotions into our conception of God, is faced early in the book (22) and indeed it is a feature of the whole treatise that it does not ignore what is to be said from other points of view.

It is not often that the case for what is termed 'the higher anthropomorphism' is so frankly urged. The references to this admitted principle are constant throughout the book. It is claimed for anthropomorphism that every 'form' of the spirit is marked by it (11), that religious development does not abandon but purify it (37), that it has the support of the Scholastics in their *via eminentiae* and also of the Lord himself (60), that it has its counterpart in a 'theomorphic' doctrine of man (87), that there is a continuity between love human and love divine (224). What is best in man has its source in the nature of God and so we may reason from what is within to what is Beyond. It is in keeping with this dominant element in the book's teaching that God is regarded as entering into history (44), as being personal, though not under our limitations, and therefore as creating, willing, loving (160), that his foreknowledge is not absolute (242), that, though all be not predetermined, there is still providence in the universe (264 sqq.), and that even a sense of humour and a feeling of surprise are not incompatible with the nature of the Most High (244).

It is possible that the argument of the book will raise questions in two quarters.

The God of the Philosophers is not the God of Christian experience and Dr. Matthews makes no attempt to prove that He can be so. The Hebrew and the Greek elements in religion are difficult to fuse. Neither in Neoplatonism nor in Scholasticism (96, 101) are the two elements of experience and speculative thought brought into real unity. The cold, pure, remote Being, which men have known as the Idea of the Good, as the One, as the Absolute, as the Unknowable, as the hidden Reality, stands in evident contrast to the Living God of the Old Testament and to the Father in Heaven of the New. Dr. Matthews is concerned to justify the latter view. He is no worshipper of the 'Deus Absconditus' and he plainly tells the philosophers that they should remember, in dealing with religion, that they have no consensus of opinion among themselves (115), and that the universe of the metaphysician is not one in which the human spirit would find it good to dwell (82). It is not that Dr. Matthews has quarrelled with the philosophers. He has learned too much from them and is always ready to acknowledge his indebtedness. But he clearly thinks their interpretation inadequate. If Plato met Jeremiah, it would be difficult to find common ground on which the philosopher and the prophet could discuss their differences: 'The personal, psychological, living God of Hebrew tradition and piety has never been successfully identified with the God of metaphysics whose ancestry derives from Greece' (42). So throughout the book, combined with much recognition of what Christianity has owed to philosophy ancient and modern, there does run the conviction of the writer that religion has its own place and validity and that abstract thinking has often ignored

elements which the human spirit has good reason to deem of great price. Probably the philosophers will still shrink from involving their Godhead so intimately in the particularities and contingencies and limitations of the temporal process. The 'steadfastness of a good man' will seem to them an insufficient image of the divine immutability (255). Both they and Dr. Matthews stand between the many and the One and would fain effect reconciliation between the two. But the position of the philosophers is considerably nearer to the One.

The book naturally has frequent references to recent development in science. Dr. Matthews is glad to quote Eddington and Whitehead, and recognises that the acknowledged insufficiency of mechanism will have its results in philosophy. 'We may, I think, sum up the tendency of the modern mind by saying that it is being forced, even against its will, to take up again the old problems of philosophy in a new form and from a new angle' (119). But the author's conviction remains that the essentials of Christian Theology are not invalidated by recent movements in science, that 'there is no inherent incompatibility between the modern conception of the Universe and Christian experience' (88), even that 'the purpose of creation, we may believe, is spiritual' (222). There are likely to be readers of this book who, while desiring to share the sane optimism of its author, will still find some little difficulty in reconciling this attitude with some of his admissions. They will feel the force of Pascal's words, 'Le silence éternel de ces espaces infinis m'effraie.' They will remain puzzled by the seeming indifference of the universe to the things which humanity deems of most account. Dr. Matthews admits that 'the comfortable anthromorphism of Christian imagination' is no longer secure (119), that there are purposes in the universe which are not our purposes (222), that when we lay exclusive stress upon human values there is danger that the frame may seem too large for the picture' (*ib.*). These admissions are frankly made and do not cause Dr. Matthews serious trouble. To other minds their implications may be more disturbing.

The Christian Religion, equally with that of the Old Testament, has always banked upon the future. It has recognised the limitations of present knowledge and left the Problem of Evil and the Riddle of the Universe till the fuller light is come. Dr. Matthews admits that the lack of any complete Theodicy 'constitutes for modern men one of the gravest obstacles to belief in God' (73). In this ultimate sense the argument of the book rests no doubt upon faith. What large measure of justification and what valuable alliance such faith may find in experience, this constructive volume shows with marked success. We have here an admirable statement of the case for Christianity under modern conditions of thought. Not the least element in its value is the writer's candid recognition of views and opinions which are not his own.

The book is well and carefully printed, but surely on p. 134, line 16, for 'immanence' we should read 'transcendence.'

It is natural to close our notice of this book with a word of congratulation to the writer on his recent appointment to the Deanery of Exeter. In a time when the life of a Bishop is so filled with details and the minor duties of administration that it is difficult for him to be a constant student and a great teacher, added value attaches to the opportunities of a Dean. King's College and the Chapel of Grays Inn will miss Dr. Matthews but his services to theology will gain scope and leisure by his appointment. We wish him well in his new position.

R.B.T.

'BOTH LORD AND CHRIST.'*

Can we ever hope to know the historic Jesus—the Jesus who lived out a short life in Palestine and who 'suffered under Pontius Pilate?' Or must we confess with Schweitzer that he must ever remain unknown to us? From the first until the present century we have had accounts and descriptions of him which have attempted to pierce the veil of faith and show us the historic Jesus—but, have they been more than 'romantic portraits?' 'The only Jesus whom we really know,' says Dr. Strachan, 'is the historical Jesus . . . who comes to us through the medium of faith.' Thus Dr. Strachan seeks to distinguish between the historical and the historic Jesus. The former is known to us through the interpretations and experience and influence of the Church: but all of these would have been impossible apart from the fact of the historic Christ whose influence and creative personality compel interpretations. Thus, the historic Christ is there in the Christian tradition—is present in the gospels themselves. 'We have the historic fact of Jesus' self-consciousness and of his own unique consciousness of Sonship . . . We have a clear vision of a historic personality whom "his contemporaries could not evade and posterity could not forget"' (p. 14). Hence the whole trend in the development of the Christian tradition has been towards a more accurate religious re-evaluation of the facts of the historic Christ. It is Dr. Strachan's theme to show that this religious re-evaluation was part of the very earliest Christian message and that it reached its climax in the Johannine conception of the historic Jesus.

Those who had companied with Jesus were unlikely to forget the outstanding facts of their Master's life and person. But they had to interpret these against the background of their Jewish hopes and beliefs. Paul helped them to interpret their experience by ascribing to Jesus a cosmic significance: and perhaps it was as a re-action against his depreciation of a knowledge of Christ 'after the flesh' that they saw the supreme need of relating the human facts of his life to their exalted conception of his place in the Divine economy.

The Pauline epistles take the fact of the Messiahship of Jesus and his consciousness of a unique relation with the Father, and by exploring the meaning and implications of these, reach the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ. This, says Dr. Strachan, is Paul's 'original contribution to the doctrine of Christ in the New Testament.' What is important here is not the form in which the doctrine is expressed but the fact that it is an attempt to relate the historic fact of Christ's person with the experience of his absolute authority. 'The conception of the pre-existent Christ is an example of mythological thinking . . . Like the doctrine of the Virgin Birth it contains something of abiding worth in our Christian faith which to-day seeks expression otherwise than in mythological terms' (p. 71). Hence Dr. Strachan attempts to express this abiding worth in a doctrine of values: 'the finality of Jesus is really the modern equivalent of Paul's doctrine of pre-existence' (p. 72).

With this exalted conception of the cosmic significance of Christ in mind, the early Church—if it was to counter-act incipient Gnosticism—was forced to give more and more attention to the details of the human life of Jesus. Hence the Epistle to the Hebrews represents a further stage in portraying the historic Christ. Here, the facts of Christ's earthly life—his obedience, trials, sufferings—find a larger place than in any other New

* *The Historic Jesus in the New Testament.* By R. H. Strachan, D.D. (S.C.M., 1931. Price 7/6. pp. 224.)

Testament letter. Its writer is concerned to show that these human experiences were the means whereby the pre-existent Son was divinely qualified for his priestly office. In this way, the writer adds another unique element to New Testament thought; and Dr. Strachan gives a very valuable exposition of what he believes to be the writer's point of view. If we may make one criticism, it is strange that Dr. Strachan never refers to Professor Nairne's work on this Epistle, where it is argued that the writer to the Hebrews intended to impress the fact that the divine glory of the Son was not *achieved by* suffering but was *expressed through* suffering. Dr. Strachan contends that this is a Johannine idea, but he never discusses this, nor does he refer to the reading (Heb. ii, 9) to which Professor Nairne appeals.

There remains the section—nearly a hundred pages—which Dr. Strachan devotes to the Fourth Gospel. It contains some very careful and valuable research into the motive and meaning of the Gospel. We do not feel that he carries conviction in his arguments against the influence of the Mystery religions (*e.g.* p. 146 has several statements of dubious accuracy). Nor is he completely convincing in banishing Hellenistic thought from the Johannine conception of the Logos and thus making this into an entirely Messianic title. But the main argument of the section is clear and forceful. For Dr. Strachan, the Fourth Gospel is the consummation (in the New Testament) of the process of re-evaluating the historic personality of Christ. It is concerned with stressing the identity of the Christ of experience with the historic Jesus whose life accounted for those experiences. His theme, therefore, (and this is true not only of the Prologue but also of the rest of the Gospel) is not the Logos, but the *Logos made flesh*. The pre-existent and exalted Christ is also the Man Christ Jesus. To bring out this theme, he edits and interprets the Synoptic material, but 'he has employed his skill as a dramatic artist in order to preserve for us an invaluable account of the consciousness of Jesus and of the significance of his person for the Christian faith' (p. 182).

We only need add that this is a book which deserves careful study in these days when it is vital for us to have an answer to the question 'What think ye of Christ?'

J.P.H.

THREE PILGRIMS.*

The record of an adventurous pilgrimage is the most interesting of all subjects, and if that adventure is one of the spirit, it is no less so than if it were of invention or exploration in other fields. Men are more ready to-day to share the story of such wayfaring with others, and the comparison of the records illuminates the story of each traveller. Such a comparison has become recently possible in the case of three life-stories remarkable not only for the tale they tell but also for the real beauty of the telling. One is the story of a scholar who was not allowed to think for himself in the Church of Rome—*Ex-Jesuit*, by Mr. E. Boyd Barrett; another the record of a scholar and man of affairs who has always insisted on thinking for himself in the Church of England—*A Wanderer's Way*, by Canon C. E. Raven; and the third that of a quite unknown parson in the same ministry, A. F. Webling, who has written in *Something Beyond* a noble story of the days that have been, and of the hopes for those that shall come.

* *Ex-Jesuit*. E. Boyd Barrett. (Geoffrey Bles, 1930. 10/6.)
Something Beyond. A. F. Webling. (Cambridge University Press, 1931. 10/6.)
A Wanderer's Way. Charles E. Raven. (Martin Hopkinson Ltd., 1929. 7/6.)

The 'Ex-Jesuit,' by his very title, suggests the pathetic ending of many dreams, for he is one who cannot altogether forget the things which are behind. Mr. Barrett's intelligence was never unmixed with romantic feeling; from early days the colour and beauty of life meant much to him. Born near Dublin into a devout Roman Catholic family, it was his mother's influence which played most upon him in childhood, and all through his life her feelings towards him, and her confidence in him, have made him stronger to go forward. The early freedom and loveliness of dawning spiritual life were hard restrained by the discipline and rigour of the education which he received at Clongowes, the great Irish Public School, but Barrett was a boy whose sensitiveness was not unaccompanied by athletic excellence, and his cricketing ability helped him to rise above circumstances where the non-athlete would have been, perhaps, more heavily overborne. But he was spiritually sensitive, nevertheless, and flung himself into his vocation as a member of the Jesuit Order. Before his novitiate he spent a year at work in a Dublin office, and then the conflict of his ideals with the blunt ugliness of life came home for the first time to his consciousness. But his vocation remained, and the years that follow tell the story of its working out. Early signs of independence aroused the irritation of his superiors, especially his dislike of spying and tale-bearing, methods approved by them for the maintenance of Christian morality. Yet despite those early signs of revolt against such modes of authority, his critical faculty still remained dormant. A successful scholar at Louvain, his interest in psychology and the scientific method of approaching problems are somewhat in conflict with the dogmatic assurance of superiors. First a schoolmaster, then in his early days of priesthood, his life was a quiet ecstasy of joy in the service of the Society of Jesus, and, as he himself describes it, 'he was eaten up with zeal' for his ministry. But University College, London, and more research into psychology and psycho-therapy made his position difficult, not because he had uttered or written any definite criticism of Roman dogma or belief, but simply because what he was trying to introduce into their methods of working, and his analysis of cases with which he had to deal, was not acceptable to the less well-educated or less idealistic officers above. Eventually they drove him to the U.S.A., where he discovered the S.J. to be even more zealous in its ruthless censorship and heavy-handed dislikes of untrodden ways. Although, as he claims, he had never written or said anything that might strictly be termed unorthodox, they refused him at last admittance into the Society's House in New York, and he was, to all intents and purposes, expelled. Faced with a new situation, he had to build all again the shattered fragments of a life which still retained its idealistic zeal, and to set up in private practice as a psycho-therapist. Eventual success has not dimmed his old love for the S.J. or the beauty of Roman Catholic worship: the privileges from which he is debarred are privileges nevertheless. Thus he is left at the last, even under severe and relentless persecution, without bitterness, and his demand for courage and honesty as fundamental religious virtues could only be made when fear and hypocrisy had too much been the marks of such religion as he had known. For him the appeal to Jesus must be over the appeal to the Church. It may even have to be over against the Church on occasion. To read his book is not to disagree with such a verdict in circumstances such as he describes.

Mr. Webling's book, less avowedly, but as truly, an autobiography, is the story of a man of somewhat similar temperament, with whom love and enthusiasm for the beauty of religion has always preceded intellectual reflection and criticism, and who, after many wanderings, has eventually

reached some sort of haven where these difficulties are in part transcended. He, in his childhood, showed the same appreciation for the joys and beauties of nature as the Irish priest, and his mother seems to have had as potent an influence in his spiritual development as did Barrett's. Perhaps he is more mystical, more at home with the things invisible than the Jesuit. He was a timid child, sensitive and lonely: characteristics which seem to persist throughout his life. Surrounded in earlier days by a Nonconformist atmosphere, appreciated for its warmth and depth of feeling rather than for its other qualities (for Webling obviously loves worship and ceremony and much that Anglo-Catholics specially value), he went into an office in the City, which he describes as the 'prison-house.' In revolt against this he fell in love with the poetry of Keats and Shelley, and at last came to feel a longing for the ministry of the Church of England as at first merely a way of escape from the office grind. Years of effort, a breakdown, studies at King's College, London, to which he pays a graceful and well-deserved compliment, led to eventual ordination. He, too, felt the early joy and consuming zeal of the priesthood. He, too, had accepted uncritically what he had learned, and his 'first' in the A.K.C. did not mean that he had carefully weighed all the then less liberal dogmas of that institution of sound learning. Perhaps it is unlikely that many theological students there, or elsewhere, do so even in these days. Anglo-Catholicism quickly captured him, not so much for what it was, as for that great friend 'Hallam' made it; a system of universal joy and wide charity, ministering to all the diverse needs of men. When 'Hallam' went, and Webling saw 'Catholicism' pushed to its coldly logical conclusions and into a set rigidity by men whose narrowness belied the title they paraded, he began to examine the premises on which the whole theory was based, and so to view the full impact of modern critical science in its application to New Testament and ecclesiastical origins. The result was a weakening of all that had once so gripped him, although the warmth and worshipful capacity of his nature made much of 'Anglo-Catholicism' still mean a great deal to him. He owes to Modernism more than he can say, although, curiously, he feels that its work is chiefly iconoclastic. It may have been so at one time, but to-day there is surely a real positive contribution which Modernism is making to Christian thought generally, and which is finding its way out in diverse ways in the evangelistic progress of the Church. But he misses in Modernism the 'conviction' which always achieves so much — vagueness may be substituted for vigour. His shaken foundations made much that the Church stands for seem unacceptable, but his way out came through practical service in the little country village where he had accepted a living. A period of scepticism about the possibility of life after death was ended by an inquiry into spiritualism, and a virtual acceptance of much for which the leaders of that inquiry contend. So he looks still to 'Something Beyond,' and if his life could be characterized by any demand, it would be, as Goethe's, for 'Light—more Light!' Reviewing all his life, he agrees with Barrett in calling for a practised religion wide enough and great enough to sustain the warmth of ideals: a religion where the intellect is not constricted or set aside, but where worship is real and fervent, and where the leading of the inner light may freely be followed.

Canon Raven's 'A Wanderer's Way' is the story of a scholar, preacher and thinker who has come by different ways than those of these two wayfarers. He, too, notes in his youth the influence of his mother, and the appeal of nature to him is deep and moving. But streets and cities have always captured his enthusiasm, and his life has been among the busier

haunts of men. Barrett's success at a public school was not Raven's, for he was not of the shining athletes, and cared more for individualistic pursuits, which have generally been anathema to orthodox public school authorities. He needed religion, but the religion offered to him was much too external and cool for the warmer sides of his personality. But the ideal of Jesus as 'Hero' and 'Poet' captured him, and has remained with him. Something of the warmly mystic experience felt by both Barrett and Webling is described, too, by Raven: all three are richly sensitive to this side of religious experience. Raven's criticism of much for which Catholicism contends is based on similar premises as those from which the others begin also: that there seems often a definite conflict between these demands and those made by Jesus Himself. It is interesting to notice, again, that Canon Raven had some experience of work in an office at Liverpool, and made contact with the uglier sides of life in that year. Cambridge afforded him field for high intellectual achievement, and also for doing what neither of the others seems ever to have been tempted to do — becoming engaged. Thus, while Canon Raven can speak of his wife as one certainty in a shaken world, with Jesus as the other, Barrett and Webling are left with the one alone. Canon Raven's ordination meant to him, as to the others, a real experience of high endeavour and warm emotional discovery. His subsequent career is well enough known, and it is not strange that, near the end of his story, he writes words which might well have been written by either of the other two: 'Stumbling along, often losing the road, often wandering at large, often tripped up and bruised and shaken, I have yet my little moments when a new piece of country opens up ahead.' His description of the mystic sense of Jesus through the long days of the battlefield is familiar to many: his assurance of the reality of Jesus as firm and as secure as that shown by the others. Thus he also ends with the sense of the universal appeal of Jesus over and above all his representatives and representative organizations: so, too, he asks the same wider charity that is, as they believe, Christ's, as opposed to the narrower boundaries set by the leaders of those who follow Him.

There are certain striking similarities between the lives of all three of these writers, who have shared with others the story of their pilgrimages. Each of them bears witness to the influence of his mother upon his earlier religious life: the fathers seem to have been less closely identified with these early days. It was in the lives of their mothers that each glimpsed first the warmth and idealism of Christian living. Each of them needed to be caught by the beauty and courage of Christianity rather than by its intellectual honesty and fearlessness: yet each eventually demanded that also. Each of them was shaken out of tendencies to narrow ecclesiastical certainties, by an experience of the world outside the ministry: all were clerks in offices, Barrett and Raven for one year each, and Webling for twelve years. It may be that an office is 'Angel Pavement' all the while, and even Webling, though to him his office was a 'Prison House,' does not write bitterly of what he went through there. Raven alone married; the two others seem singularly free from either inclination or regrets in that direction. They all display, together with their responsiveness to the call to something beyond, a cautious thoughtfulness and a weighing of consequences, and their wanderings are never the mere vagaries of dilettantes. 'Ex-Jesuit' looks back to the days of his priesthood, but forward to days of useful service as a psycho-therapist: Raven and Webling look chiefly to something beyond, but their thoughts dwell also on the days that are passed away. They are all three men who have here no abiding city,

and who, not without pain and sadness, yet always with courage and faith, are adventurers and pilgrims towards the high prize of the calling wherewith they believe themselves to have been called.

Ealing, W.5. MARCUS KNIGHT.

THE LAST OF THE GERMAN LIBERALS.

Ernst Troeltsch was born in 1865 and died in 1923. He was successively Professor of Theology at Heidelberg (from 1894 to 1915) and of Philosophy at Berlin (from 1915 until his death). The treatise of which we have just received a translation is perhaps the work which Troeltsch would have regarded as his *opus magnum*; it was published in German in 1911, and is now the first of the four volumes which make up his *Gesammelte Schriften.*[1]

Troeltsch was the last of the great pre-War German theologians. None of them recognized more strongly than he the need for a synthesis between Christianity and culture. In his conviction that Christianity must come to terms with modern thought, that it must be reinterpreted in the terms of modern categories, he was at one with Harnack and the Liberals. But the possibility of this synthesis, which Harnack and his friends had assumed as almost beyond question, became for Troeltsch a profound philosophical problem. How, asked Troeltsch, is a synthesis possible between a religion which, like Christianity, claims to be of absolute validity and a *Weltanschauung* such as that of the Modern World, which is in the nature of things a historical and transitory phenomenon? If Christianity, he asked, were to be interpreted in terms of our modern categories, would it not *ipso facto* lose its absolute character? Would it not by the very act of synthesis degenerate from being the universal religion into just a religion of one passing culture?

Troeltsch's work can be understood only when the gravity of this problem is realised. For Troeltsch, the problem of all problems was to find a solution of it. All the scepticism against absolute standards which the evolutionary philosophy and the historical outlook had brought in their train were, as it were, focussed in him. He understood, as few others, the nature of history—apparently it was from Dilthey that he learnt most about it—and he realized that if truth were to be found in history, then truth too would be relativized. For at any rate some of his life, he was willing to take this course and to accept the consequences. We find him, accordingly, speaking of truth as being 'polymorphous,' and maintaining that what was true for one epoch of the world's history was not necessarily true at a later date. So deeply did this historical relativism enter his soul that he would not attach finality to any of his own conclusions. He was constantly fighting his way through to new standpoints. Before one problem was solved, he had discovered that there were a host of others which had come up on the way, and it was this inner dialectic which drove him on.

These facts account for the exceptionally stimulating character which his writings possess. They continually arouse the reader from his 'dogmatic slumbers.' (This is well exemplified in an essay entitled 'What is the meaning of the expression "The Essence of Christianity"?' where

* *The Social Teaching of the Christian Church.* By Ernst Troeltsch. Translated by Olive Wyon. 2 vols. (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1931. Price 42/- the set of two vols. The Halley Stewart Publications, I.)

[1] The *Gesammelte Schriften*, however, are far from complete. Thus they do not include either *Die Absolutheit des Christentums* nor *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus* referred to below.

the issue raised by the famous Harnack-Loisy controversy is discussed with great penetration.) But though Troeltsch carries the reader on, he does not usually bring him to a resting-place. And Troeltsch himself found that his researches were drawing him almost whither he would not. In 1915 he took the very significant step of resigning his professorship in theology in favour of one in philosophy; those who know anything of the German University system—with its sharp dividing lines between the faculties—will appreciate the importance of this step. The fact that Troeltsch never found a final position gives some justification for a Roman Catholic writer (Emil Spiess) speaking of his life as a 'tragedy.'

Apart from the volumes before us, Troeltsch's three most extensive writings deal directly with the problem of the relationship of history to absolute standards. The earliest of these, *Die Absolutheit des Christentums* (1901) raises the problem acutely. Troeltsch believed that a certain superiority attached to those religions which *claim* finality, and as such Christianity was among the highest of the existing religions. But, he held, the *proof* that it will not be eventually superseded was impossible. Next came his treatise *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt* (1906), which was translated into English in the Crown Theological Library and less aptly called *Protestantism and Progress*. Here Troeltsch raises the question as to the date at which the 'Modern World' began; and he decides that it was in the eighteenth century. It is not surprising that this conclusion brought him into sharp conflict with many of the Protestant theologians, who found the significance of Luther's work in the sixteenth century thereby reduced. The third of them, *Der Historismus und seine Probleme* (1922) is the greatest of his fruits while in the philosophical faculty at Berlin. It is an invaluable and extremely suggestive account of the attempts made by modern thinkers to deduce absolute norms from history, and deserves a much wider circle of students in England than it probably has.

The *Sociallehren,* the book now before us, was produced in the midst of all these studies, and its purpose can be understood only in the light of them. Outwardly a purely historical study, it is really part of a colossal systematic programme. One of the chief points where Christianity rubs shoulders with culture is in the matter of sociology. Every society, from the tribe of primitive savages to the highly complex civilization of modern America, has built up its life in accordance with its social theories and practices; and these sociological principles are derived from the most divergent historical sources. But Christianity also seems to present to the world a code of social principles; and if so, the Christian must regard this code as final. It is to be found partly in the Sermon on the Mount, partly in the 'communism' of the primitive Church (which some Christians have thought to be normative), partly elsewhere in the Scriptures. What has been the mutual relationship between these two sets of principles—between those eternal principles rooted in the Gospel and those which Christians as members of a human society have derived from other sources? To the attempts to answer this question the present volume is devoted. Its method is historical. The whole period of Christian history up to the end of the eighteenth century is covered, and the volumes reveal an amazing range of historical knowledge. Sometimes, it is true, there are wide fields omitted. Thus while the Nonconformist theories of the seventeenth century are treated at considerable length, there is practically nothing about the Church of England. Troeltsch, indeed, in an essay written in 1922 (*Ges. Schr.,* iv, 12), recognized the need for an analysis of seventeenth century

Anglicanism if the book were ever revised. The Patristic period, too, comes off rather badly. On the other hand, medieval sociology, as well as the social theories of early Lutheranism and Calvinism and of the pietistic sects, receive very detailed attention. Troeltsch adopts Max Weber's thesis concerning the importance of Calvin's ethical doctrines for the growth of capitalism. Calvin was the first theologian to deny that the Old Testament prohibitions of usury applied to the Christian state; and this new attitude to the question of money, together with the Puritan belief that all spending beyond the necessities of life was wrong, did much to make England and America (for here it was that Calvinistic influences were particularly potent) the most prosperous countries in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and, up till the present time, the chief banking centres of the world.

Troeltsch's German is not easy. It is his style rather than his thought which is difficult; though, once the style has been mastered, it will be found to run freely. Troeltsch had a great love for portmanteau-words, and these naturally are stumbling-blocks to a translator. The translation of the volumes before us, however, is extremely well done; and if the reader finds that here and there the English is not quite so easy as what he is accustomed to, we would refer him to the original and ask him to consider if he could have done better. If, as we trust, a second printing of this work is called for, the only improvement which we would suggest is that the index be put at the end of *each* volume.

We hope that these volumes will send many readers to a study of the other works of Troeltsch. For our own part, we believe that those who are seeking for a synthesis between modern culture and Christianity will derive much more profit from them than from the writings of the majority of Troeltsch's successors in German Protestant theology. A recent German writer has extolled the fact that post-War theology is orientating itself again on Luther; and the revival of the old German theological tradition with its hostility to culture (which Luther himself derived from the later anti-intellectualist Scholastics) is being received by many Germans with acclamation. There is an essential kinship between Troeltsch and the Liberals on the one hand and the best English theology of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as represented by Lightfoot, Westcott, *Lux Mundi*, Rashdall and Professor Taylor, on the other. If the emphasis in the German Liberals was on the side of morality and that of the English theologians more on the side of metaphysics, they at least shared a profound belief in the Doctrine of the Incarnation. We doubt if orthodox Lutheranism has ever appreciated this doctrine in its fulness.

F. L. Cross.

COURAGE, TRUTH, PURITY.*

'A leader of note in spiritual things, as in learning, among the men of his generation.' So writes the Archbishop of Armagh, no mean judge, of the late Dr. Charles, author of these sermons, in a short Memoir bound up with them. Brief though it is, the Memoir reveals the heroism of a personal life and a life's work which had greater influence than many lives which provide matter for more thrilling biography. Dr. Charles is certainly not among those who leave 'no memorial,' if, indeed, there are any such. Admiration of his immense learning and of the extent of his literary work will be deepened by the knowledge that it was accomplished in such weak-

* *Courage, Truth, Purity.* By R. H. Charles, D.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., sometime Archdeacon of Westminster. With a Brief Memoir by the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Armagh. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1931. Price 6/-.)

ness of body that he had not known 'three consecutive good nights of sleep for forty-one years, and hardly one good night since 1915.' Dr. D'Arcy indicates, even to those who could not deduce it for themselves, something of the enormous amount of work, including the acquisition of several languages, which lay behind Dr. Charles' volumes. These, beginning with his edition of and commentary upon the *Book of Enoch,* and followed by book after book of translations and studies in the apocalyptic and pseud-epigraphic literature, were pioneer work; they had very great influence upon New Testament study, and brought their author world-wide fame. If his earlier preaching in Westminster Abbey dispersed the congregation, when it was published in the little book in the Home University Library, *Religious Development between the Old and the New Testaments,* it secured an enormous circulation and has since been translated into several languages, including Chinese and Japanese. Dr. Charles realised why his early Abbey orations failed as sermons, and he changed their form with the result that, as Dr. D'Arcy says, 'thoughtful people crowded the Abbey to hear his careful examination of debatable questions and his usually decided conclusions.' Notwithstanding the work involved in the preparation of these discourses, Dr. Charles produced two of the most remarkable and learned commentaries of modern times in *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* and *The Book of Daniel.*

Dr. Charles' was a life controlled by the virtues which are the subjects of three of the sermons in the present book, which have been chosen as its title and which admirably indicate its contents. This is not a further collection of discourses upon difficult theological problems, but a series of plain sermons on matters moral and religious. Here are the captions of a few: The Victory over the World, Christ's Bequest of Peace, God's Wisdom for the Humble, The Resurrection Life, The Soul's Cry for Salvation, The Certainty of the Faithful Seeker, The Chief End of Man's Life, The Praise of Men, The Atrophy of Unused Powers, Prayer. The language is plain and direct. Many gems of pulpit oratory are meant only to be heard, and cannot be read without disaster to the original impression created by them. That is not true of the twenty-two sermons here printed, which will profit the careful reader. Those who knew the author, his personal attractiveness and unfailing kindness, the ever-ready glad excitement in the subjects of his study and the mental energy which appeared too strong for the rather frail body which gave it expression, will not be surprised at what they will read in this book, and all will find some explanatory light shed upon the great achievements of a noble Christian life.

J. S. Bezzant.

AN ANTROPOLOGIST ON SEX.*

Traditional sexual morality, says Mr. Briffault, has a double origin. It may be traced back on the one hand to the tabu rules of savages, regarded by them as of supernatural origin and validity; and on the other hand to social rules which were the product of a particular stage of civilization. The restrictions inspired by tabu, generally based upon conceptions of the influence and power of magic, are, of course, older and more primitive than the restrictions which proceeded from some definite sort of social organization. But the traces of a tabu-born ethic still persist along with an ethic which is the product of a higher—or at least more developed—stage of culture.

* *Sin and Sex.* By Robert Briffault. (Allen & Unwin, 1931. 7/6.)

Mr. Briffault is the author of a monumental anthropological work—*The Mothers*, wherein the matriarchal stage of social development is exhaustively examined. Mr. Briffault may be described as belonging to the matriarchal school of anthropology, as against an authority like Professor Malinowsky, who is a patriarchalist. To the plain man such distinctions may seem academic or meaningless, but the controversies of the scientific specialists may nevertheless have considerable bearing upon practical issues. Speaking generally the patriarchalists, like Malinowsky, regard the institution of marriage, more or less in the form we know it, as both primitive and natural to humanity. The man is the head of the family, and 'possesses' his wife in much the same way as he possesses his property, the patriarchal stage of society being that in which the institution of property, generally cattle, had attained a certain degree of development. The early books of the Old Testament have made this sort of social organization familiar to everybody. On the other hand the matriarchal form of social organization is one where the woman is not attached as his property to any particular man, and where family descent is reckoned from the woman and not from the man. Those who hold that this basis of society is preferable to the patriarchal, regard the latter as a masculine institution doomed to decay as women emancipate themselves from it. Mr. Briffault is one of those who frankly look forward to this consummation; and he holds that the social and economic emancipation of women which we are now witnessing is the beginning of the end. 'With the repudiation of the patriarchal subordination of women, the whole edifice of traditional Western sexual morality collapses from its immemorial pedestal into the meltingpot.' He claims that the institution of marriage is designed to meet economic needs primarily, and biological needs only secondarily and inadequately, and that it should be the business of the bank-manager rather than of the priest to conduct the marriage ceremony under the present patriarchal dispensation.

Although thus critical of traditional morality, Mr. Briffault does not invite his readers to an unrestrained self-indulgence. He observes that 'Infringements of traditional sexual restrictions, however unreasonable those restrictions may be, are under existing conditions a cause of great injury and suffering.' So long as the social tabus exist, gross injuries to innocent persons will result from their transgression. But, at the same time, the sufferings of a 'seduced' girl, like Tess, for example, are not so much the effects of immorality, as of traditional morality. Mr. Briffault has some useful remarks in this connection. 'The term "seduction" with its patriarchal implications of feminine mental helplessness and passivity, has practically dropped out of use in modern speech. The discarding of the term is not altogether justified. It is as possible to be dishonest in love as in business. To obtain sexual gratification by false pretences is as common as to obtain money by the same means. The current toleration of fraud in business transactions does not altogether excuse its employment in sex relations. To induce by false pretences a woman to yield herself is unjust and immoral. It is of course, every bit as unjust and immoral for a woman to seduce a man by false pretences as for a man to seduce a woman . . . Allowance has been made for the delusions of erotic emotion sedulously fostered by sentimentalizing moral tradition. But there is, over and above that involuntary self-deception, far more insincerity and fraud in the relations between the sexes than there should be.'

Mr. Briffault hopes that women in their new and natural desire for emancipation will not be deluded by 'any feminist vision of pseudo-matriarchal unisexual adaptation,' which will only mean repeating the mistakes

of patriarchalism. Both unilateral attitudes 'are equally opposed to th full realization of the man-woman relation in the social-cultural maturit of its development. The adaptation must be a mutual one.' It is no us setting up under the disguise of female independence the old self-defensiv individualism which for so long has inspired the mechanism of marita relationships under the patriarchal dispensation. 'If any man-woma relation of association is recognised it is a relation of co-operation, not o strategical self-defence. If that co-operation be a visionary and impossibl ideal, there is no alternative but the biological sex-battle, no sexual organi zation but promiscuity. Social and cultural conditions are not biological they are artificial, as is all that men and women value.'

This book is vigorously written, ably thought out, and, in short, a mos valuable treatise upon a subject of vital import for civilization. Traditiona lists will not like it, but a perusal of it will do them no harm.

J.C.H.

SHORT NOTICES.

The title of *Vitality* (Malcolm Spencer, M.A., S.C.M., 3/6, 1931), i arresting for a religious book, but, in spite of the author's explanations, i is possible that some will imagine that it provides advice about breathing diet or 'glands of hope and glory.' However it is actually an attempt t point the way towards a richer life through a practical communion wit God. It is written for those who want to be in 'first rate fettle for each day's work and play or know the reason why.' Just as the human body depends for its vitality upon certain forms of nourishment and exercise, s too our spiritual lives can receive vitality through certain channels of ap preciation, understanding and creative effort. We commend this book not only because of its devotional value but also because it translates the idea of communion with God into terms relating to every-day life. The same is true of *The Spiritual Pilgrimage of St. Paul* (F. H. Ballard, M.A., price 4/- and 2/6, S.C.M., 1931), which is a penetrating study of some of the problems of life with which the Apostle dealt. But it is not an arid commentary on past problems; after an introduction which gives the background necessary to the understanding of the Apostle's place in contemporary thought, the discussion of such problems as those of suffering, the ethics of business and of controversy, etc., is linked up with modern needs. And the book is illuminated by a skilful use of quotations.

There is a quiet vein of humour running through *The Task of Happiness* (by C. A. Alington, D.D., S.C.M., price 3/6, 1931), which makes it a very readable book. It deals with some of the problems of home life and the bringing up of children, and Dr. Alington's great experience as Headmaster of Eton is obvious in the sympathetic and understanding way in which he deals with matters concerning the welfare of children. It is one of those books about which you feel that the writer is so frank in confessing his own difficulties that he must know something about yours too. Parents should find it most helpful.

For a real understanding of the relationship between poetry and prayer and of the way in which the poet can help us in the life of prayer, we know of nothing so excellent as *Poetry and Prayer* (by Edward Shillito, M.A., S.C.M., price 3/6). It is a deep study couched in the language of beauty itself: and if it contains more than one can take in at a single reading, this only means that one will return to it again with fresh delight.

J.P.H.